

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: : 2:12-md-02342-CMR
: PHILADELPHIA, PA
ZOLOFT :
(SERTRALINE HYDROCHLORIDE): September 2, 2015
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION :
- - -

TRANSCRIPT OF DAUBERT HEARING DAY 3
BEFORE THE HONORABLE CYNTHIA M. RUFE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

Plaintiff's Steering Committee Co-Lead Counsel:	DIANNE NAST, ESQ. RODANAST P.C. 801 ESTELLE DRIVE LANCASTER, PA 17601
	JOSEPH ZONIES, ESQ. STEPHEN CORR, ESQ. SEAN TRACEY, ESQ.
Defendants' Lead and Liaison Counsel:	MARK S. CHEFFO, ESQ. SKADDEN ARPS SLATE MEAGHER & FLOM LLP FOUR TIMES SQUARE NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036
AUDIO OPERATOR:	CSR OPERATOR
TRANSCRIBER:	JANINE THOMAS NOTARY PUBLIC

(Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording,
transcript produced by transcription service.)

VERITEXT NATIONAL COURT REPORTING COMPANY
MID-ATLANTIC REGION
1801 Market Street - Suite 1800
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
(888) 777-6690

I N D E X

Page

WITNESS	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
NICHOLAS JEWELL	3	98	114	

1 Q. Let's go to -- doctor let me show you some testimony,
2 see if it refreshes your recollection in Avandia.

3 A. Sure.

4 Q. See if we can do this.

5 MS. YATES: Your Honor, may I approach.

6 THE COURT: You may.

7 BY MS. YATES:

8 Q. Tiny print, I apologize. But this was your Avandia
9 testimony, Judge Rufe in re Avandia. Okay. And so you're
10 talking about, "We are fortunate because there are randomized
11 controlled trials;" right?

12 A. Uh-huh.

13 Q. We talked about that, "And then subsequently then I
14 would go on and look for information about the observational
15 studies." Does that refresh your recollection? There are a
16 number of observation studies?

17 A. There certainly were. I know -- memory there are
18 certainly a number of observational studies about Avandia, but
19 the body of my report and my testimony before Judge Rufe was
20 about the, the randomized clinical trials.

21 Q. Oh, but you did review them; right?

22 A. I did review them, but I didn't put them in my report.
23 I focused my report to use your words on the randomized
24 clinical trial information for which there was a lot and there
25 were a lot of -- there were close to 50 if my memory is

1 correct of randomized clinical trials. That was the focus of
2 my report. That's my memory, I didn't spend any of my report
3 discussing the observational study information. There
4 certainly is some.

5 Q. Right. And so, okay. I'm not going to belabor it.

6 All right. Let's go back to see if we can agree. You advised
7 the Court and Avandia that there are formal techniques in a
8 meta-analysis that are designed to make sure studies are
9 weighted properly, you agree with that; right?

10 A. Yes. There's, meta-analysis is an averaging process as
11 I indicated and it's going to weight it, different studies
12 differently because of the, you know, for example the sample
13 sizes can be substantially different.

14 Q. Because the little guys don't have the same weight as
15 the big studies.

16 A. That's a nice way of putting it, yes.

17 Q. Okay. And these techniques make sure that you don't
18 make the improper mistakes of averaging results so that no
19 study has an undue influence; correct?

20 A. It should have its influence based on the weighting
21 scheme which is usually a sample size driven scheme, but not
22 always. Sometimes it's a little bit more sophisticated.

23 Q. And you've testify in this case that you can't do a
24 meta-analysis because of this heterogeneity; correct?

25 A. I'm not saying you can't do it, you can it's just you

1 have to be very careful in interpreting it, because the
2 averaging involved weighting or not can mislead you when you
3 rely on the results of the summary when there's substantial
4 variation in the individual trials.

5 Q. All right. Do you agree doctor that based on the
6 heterogeneity the problem that you have in Zolofit is that the
7 averaging that meta-analysis does pretty gets you nowhere,
8 that's your opinion.

9 A. No. That's maybe, that's not my words. I wouldn't say
10 get you nowhere. It's just you have to pay attention to the
11 heterogeneity in interpreting the results that it gives. As I
12 tried to make this clear yesterday if you have two studies one
13 of which shows an odds ratio of two and one of which shows
14 odds ratio of .5, let's say equally weighted to make it simple
15 and you do a meta-analysis and you come out and report in the
16 literature and an odds ratio of 1.0 and interpret no risk,
17 first of all that's an incorrect statistical interpretation
18 and it's clearly misleads, because of your women in the study
19 had an odds ratio of 2. No one had an odds ratio of 1 as it
20 happens, so that's why it's misleading and I can go on in
21 greater detail as to why it's misleading, but I thought that
22 made it clear that in those kinds of situations you can't
23 resort to meta-analysis to resolve the inconsistency or the
24 heterogeneity of the two studies.

25 Q. So, let's take a look at your deposition. Do you

1 remember having your deposition taken in a Zolofit case called
2 Trace Foster it was pending in St. Louis?

3 A. I don't recall again, the details of the specific
4 depositions.

5 Q. And we can put it up on the screen. If you turn to
6 page 103, doctor, starting at line 7.

7 Q: You're perfectly capable of searching pub med [ph]
8 and [indiscernible] defined set of inclusion, exclusion
9 criteria and accumulating the data the same way Miles and the
10 same way McDonough [ph] did; correct? And the answer goes on
11 for a bit, so bear with me.

12 A: Well, but your misinterpreting my answer. That
13 certainly was not the obstacle. The obstacle is the data
14 itself does lend itself for a meta-analysis to be useful. A
15 meta-analysis is an averaging process. If you want to take an
16 apple and an orange and average it, there's no obstacle to
17 doing it. You can do it. You can take orange juice and apple
18 juice and mix them together. There's no physical obstacle to
19 doing. Does it make sense? Sometimes averaging does. I've
20 lived most of my life where average is terribly valuable, but
21 the statisticians that have known for a long time that
22 averaging can be horribly misleading and in this case with
23 this amount of heterogeneity cross studies averaging gets you
24 pretty much nowhere. So this is not a prime candidate of
25 doing an effective meta-analysis in my view.

1 Q. Did I read that correctly?

2 A. You read that correctly and that's exactly what I said
3 yesterday.

4 Q. Doctor, so you said there when you got this
5 heterogeneity problem it's like mixing apples and oranges;
6 right?

7 A. That would be the like the .5 and the 2 in my
8 hypothetical example.

9 Q. Right. Do you recall that in Avandia you were asked
10 about heterogeneity and whether it was like mixing apples and
11 oranges?

12 A. I can't recall the details of the discussion 10 years
13 ago.

14 Q. Isn't it true sir, that you told the Court that it's
15 not like mixing apples and oranges, but rather mixing
16 different types of apples?

17 A. Well, idea have to see the testimony.

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. It does sound like something I would say and that would
20 refer -- the idea of apple and an orange is heterogeneity
21 right? An apple's quite different. If I held it in my hand
22 you could tell the difference; right?

23 Q. I sure hope so.

24 A. If I held two different varieties of an apple in my
25 hand could you tell the difference?

1 Q. Possibly.

2 A. But maybe not; right.

3 Q. I could tell the difference in those wine glasses.

4 A. Yes, but that's an apple and an orange. Let's not
5 change the metaphor. If I have two apples, distinct varieties
6 of apples you probably couldn't, well maybe they look enough
7 the same. Maybe I can combine these. That's exactly what I'm
8 saying in this testimony here and that's exactly what I said
9 yesterday, that's exactly what I'm saying now.

10 When you're doing an meta-analysis averaging it's fine
11 in all other things being equal to do it when you have no
12 heterogeneity, because then the averaging is voluble, you're
13 not mixing a .5 and a 2 and coming out with this distorted in
14 between value that no one experiences. And the value of
15 meta-analysis as an Avandia is you get the increased precision
16 that you get from combining multiple small studies.

17 So it's not that meta-analysis in itself is supposed to
18 give you a magical different answer from the studies, that's
19 not the purpose of meta-analysis. The purchase of
20 meta-analysis if done correctly is to take homogeneous
21 phenomenon each of which is imprecise average them and then
22 you get a measure of the phenomenon you're interested in an
23 odds ratio but with much more precision. That's the point of
24 averaging always. That's the point of meta-analysis, but you
25 don't do it and mislead people when they're so much

1 heterogeneity. That's what I said in this, you just read me,
2 that's what I said back in the Avandia case. That's what I
3 said yesterday and that's what I'm saying today.

4 Q. All right, doctor. Let's go to I believe it's the same
5 transcript page 31. Oh, I'm sorry, it's not the same
6 transcript. So we're now going to the Avandia transcript?

7 A. Okay.

8 Q. Okay? If you turn to page 31, line 6.

9 Q: Another thing I wanted to ask you --

10 A. Sorry, could you just -- which page was it?

11 Q. I am so sorry. Page 31.

12 A. 31, thank you.

13 Q. Line 6.

14 A. Thank you.

15 Q. And actually we can -- you'll see on the middle of page
16 30 yesterday the word heterogeneity came up; right? So, let's
17 just give a little bit of context there. Now we can go to
18 page 31 line 6.

19 Q: The other thing I wanted to ask you about is it
20 like mixing apples and oranges?

21 A: Well, of course a key thing in a well conducted
22 meta-analysis one of the limitations I think I refer to here
23 is that the clinical trials that you are combining or
24 observational studies if it's a meta-analysis of observational
25 studies are not identical. They don't in fact one, you can

1 view that as a strength and a weakness. They are not at all
2 identical population. They are not sampling from exactly the
3 same population. The eligibility criteria for the trial that
4 was designed for an efficacy reason may vary from trial to
5 trial somewhat. They are done in different places. As I say,
6 this is a weakness because you are now trying to mix things
7 that were collected in different places. It's also a strength
8 because as we heard yesterday one of the important issues in
9 causation is seeing is a phenomena. Is there any idea of a
10 risk replicated in different populations, because that is
11 going to strengthen your belief that this is something causal
12 but not peculiar to a particular trial or a particular
13 population? So one of the limitations as I said and strength
14 is you are mixing these things. It's not mixing apples and
15 oranges, however, if I can use that analogy, it's mixing
16 different varieties of apples. All of these studies have the
17 same drugs applied to the treatment arm. They were all by in
18 large with some notable exceptions studying diabetics. They
19 were all essentially when the data was pulled out on adverse
20 events they were all these investigators were honestly, I
21 think trying to get at the same question. So this was not
22 really trying to pull things from out of a hat and sort of jam
23 them together, this was, most of these meta-analyses not all
24 of them but most of them were well conducted, thoughtfully and
25 trying to answer the question and summarize the information.

1 Q. Did I read that correctly?

2 A. I think you did.

3 Q. Thank you. Now doctor, I think we're well aware of
4 your criticisms of the meta-analyses on Zoloft, but you did a
5 mini meta-analysis; right?

6 A. I did as I described yesterday in the paused analysis
7 we had two major studies that allowed you to independently
8 look at the question of comparing woman on Zoloft and
9 comparing those who continued to use Zoloft during the first
10 trimester by some definition versus those who didn't and I
11 combined those two in front of the Court yesterday.

12 Q. Right. So there's a couple of steps here. Let's see
13 if we can go one at that time. You performed a calculation or
14 a reanalysis of some of the Huybrechts data comparing what you
15 say women have filled the prescription in the first trimester
16 and women who did not fill a prescription in the first
17 trimester; right?

18 A. One or more prescriptions filled, yes.

19 Q. Okay. And this analysis or calculation is not part of
20 the peer review published study of Huybrechts; right?

21 A. Well, the data are there in the peer review
22 publication. That particular calculation is not.

23 Q. Right. That was my question. And it's not part of the
24 investigator's methods; correct?

25 A. I don't know if it's -- but an investigator certainly

1 deliberately tried to separate out these women that had at
2 least one prescription filled during pregnancy, because I
3 believe in their sensitivity analysis they believe that was a
4 more rock-hard measure of exposure if you actually fill a
5 prescription you're not only were exposed in that you had a
6 previous prescription that took you through the first days
7 after conception but then you also filled one. From their
8 sensitivity analysis perception they thought that was a more
9 definitive measure of exposure and that's what they used it
10 for and I used the same data but in a slightly different way.

11 Q. Sir, your calculation was not part of the
12 investigator's methods set forth in the peer review published
13 article?

14 A. As I just indicated, yes, the data was there in the
15 supplement, but not that particular calculation, that is new,
16 yes.

17 Q. And in fact, Dr. Huybrechts has referred to your
18 reanalysis as post hoc subgroup analysis; correct?

19 A. As well as referencing it as interesting.

20 Q. And after the fact sub -- post hoc took a little bit of
21 Latin means after the fact; right?

22 A. I actually took a little bit more Latin than you.

23 Q. There you go.

24 A. But I'm surprised you didn't.

25 Q. I rejected it. I looked at it and rejected it. You

1 haven't published your reanalysis, sir?

2 A. No, I've asked, as I indicated yesterday I believe to
3 take the data from someone else's paper without approaching
4 that author directly and asking them to collaborate would be
5 not in my scientific approach, so I have asked the author if
6 she would be willing to publish them with me, because she --
7 it's her data and she knows that data and I think that would
8 be the right way. And as we discussed yesterday we're on
9 route somewhere. I don't know how it will play out in the
10 end. She may not wish to be involved given how much contact
11 she's had from lawyers in this case.

12 Q. She politely declined; right?

13 A. No. At the last e-mail she actually indicated that she
14 would maybe see if some of team could help.

15 Q. Let me back up. When you asked her to be a co-author
16 that e-mail politely declined; correct?

17 A. Yes, she said she had too many other projects at that
18 point if you want to look at the e-mails, please do.

19 Q. And --

20 A. And then at the last e-mail when he had worked through
21 what I was getting a she said that's an interesting
22 possibility or something and then I'll see if -- I'll bring it
23 up to my team and see if someone else can. I assume she's too
24 busy.

25 Q. That was your request for the data?

1 A. No. That was the request to publish the data -- well,
2 that was my request for them to run the analysis adjusting
3 for --

4 Q. Right.

5 A. -- confounding. I assumed if they did that they would
6 be willing to stand behind their work and go publish, but I
7 can't --

8 Q. That wasn't the question was it doctor?

9 A. I can't -- if you could just let me finish. I
10 couldn't, I can't speak to that. We're in the middle of
11 something here. I wrote to Dr. Huybrechts saying here is an
12 interesting analysis it's your data would you co-author? She
13 said I'm too busy and any way it doesn't adjust for
14 confounding. I said, exactly, that's why I need your help and
15 would you be -- I need the raw data. She said, I'm too busy
16 I'll see if my team can help.

17 Now whether that leads to a publication that they want
18 to be associated with or not that's for the future to decide.

19 Q. You have no idea right now; right?

20 A. Whether it will be done? Well, I can't do it. I have
21 no control, I think is a better way of putting it.

22 Q. Right.

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And the data you extracted was from the supplement from
25 the Huybrechts study; right?

1 A. That's right. The online supplement.

2 Q. And you defined some users in that supplement as
3 paused.

4 A. Well, I put paused in quotes, because --

5 Q. So did I.

6 A. Yes -- and so did you -- because the word pause comes
7 from the Jimenez-Solem paper and --

8 Q. I'm coming to that, I promise.

9 A. I understand. I --

10 Q. I'm just trying to do this -- right now the questions
11 are this long and the answers are really long doctor and I
12 really would appreciate it if you could focus a little bit
13 more on my question. I will get there and then your counsel
14 has a chance to do a redirect.

15 A. I'm sorry, I'm a teacher I can't help it. I can't turn
16 it off. That's why I put the word paused in quotes. It's a
17 slightly different definition than what's used in
18 Jimenez-Solem where they used the word pause.

19 Q. Precisely. So, number one, Dr. Huybrechts did not
20 define this population as paused; correct?

21 A. She didn't use that word, that is correct.

22 Q. And number two, your definition of paused is different
23 from the Jimenez-Solem definition; right?

24 A. Yes. As I just indicated, yes.

25 Q. And as you said, Dr. Huybrechts pointed out you haven't

1 adjusted for compounding; corrects?

2 A. And we discussed that yesterday and the rest of the
3 story.

4 Q. Now, doctor, yesterday there were a couple of slides,
5 pie charts and I'm sorry, I only have black and white, but if
6 I can use the Elmo [ph] maybe that's easier [indiscernible].
7 This pie chart was shown of this is your reanalysis of the
8 Huybrechts data and I apologize that's my handwriting,
9 Jewell's definition of pause, we've already gone through that.
10 And you've an odds ratio of 1.87 confidence in yours was 1.07
11 to 2.39 P value of .02; right? That's what you showed us
12 yesterday?

13 A. Yes. I showed two of these I believe and this is the
14 one to be precise that refers to the "paused group" I mean the
15 exposed as filling one or more prescriptions.

16 Q. Right. There was another one that talked about after
17 Dr. Gibbons commented you went and did two or more; right?

18 A. Correct.

19 Q. But then we saw another slide meta-analysis Huybrechts
20 and Jimenez-Solem. Huybrechts [indiscernible] odds ratio 1.9
21 confidences of 1.1 to 3.3.

22 A. Could you show me the previous slide just so I can --

23 Q. Yes.

24 A. Because that's where I think you're going. Yes, that
25 doesn't look right.

1 Q. It doesn't right does it doctor?

2 A. Yes, that's -- one of those is --

3 Q. Do we know which one is wrong?

4 A. Well it might take me a minute. Because if I can take
5 logs I could do the symmetry. Maybe Dr. Kimmel can do it for
6 me, he's better at that with his eye. I can't -- with that, I
7 think to be fair I should correct one of those slides after
8 I've had a chance to be in a dark room for two minutes.

9 Q. Okay. All right. One of them is wrong we don't know
10 which one?

11 A. Yes. The upper bound there looks incorrect on one of
12 those.

13 Q. Okay. And just so we're clear based on your
14 communications with Dr. Huybrechts you did not mean your
15 unpublished reanalysis to supersede Dr. Huybrechts' big
16 published study; right?

17 A. No. And I told her that, of course I didn't intend
18 that.

19 Q. Right. When you did your meta-analysis do you know if
20 you used the correct numbers?

21 A. Which meta-analysis?

22 Q. So you --

23 A. Oh, you mean the two studies?

24 Q. Yes.

25 A. I would've used the raw data itself, not the summary

1 results. So I did it myself using the raw data, not, so it's
2 the transcription error in one of those upper bounds.

3 Q. All right.

4 MS. YATES: Your Honor, I'm about to move on and
5 I can hopefully tighten things up. I'm happy to go on or I'm
6 not sure.

7 THE COURT: Well, it is a lunch break time.

8 MS. YATES: Lunch break. Okay.

9 THE COURT: And I think we ask take the hour
10 again if that's not enough let me know, because we can easily
11 come back at 2:00, but it is appropriate to break now for a
12 lunch recess. So why don't we get here in an hour and assess
13 where we are and that would be 10 minutes to 2:00.

14 MS. YATES: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 THE COURT: Thank you.

16 (Whereupon there was a recess in the
17 proceeding from 12:49 p.m. to 1:56 p.m.)

18 THE COURT: Have a seat.

19 BY MS. YATES:

20 Q. Hello doctor.

21 A. High.

22 Q. We left off with your post hoc subgroup analysis from
23 the Huybrechts that you then created your mini meta-analysis
24 with Jimenez-Solem and we were agreeing that that subgroup
25 reanalysis does not replace the overall study results, so I

1 just wanted to go to Dr. Huybrechts conclusion based on her
2 overall study results if we could show that please.
3 Huybrechts page 2405. Huybrechts is in your binder and we'll
4 try and bring it up here as well, but page 2405. Okay? With
5 me doctor?

6 A. Not yet.

7 Q. Lower right-hand side, right-hand column, page 2405.

8 A. Yes, I'm with you now.

9 Q. All right. The authors in Huybrechts conclude, in
10 conclusion our results suggest that the use of antidepressants
11 during the first trimester does not substantively increase the
12 risk of specific cardiac defects. Did I read that correctly?

13 A. You read it correctly.

14 Q. And then they go onto state if you turn onto page 2405
15 to 2406. The accumulated evidence. The accumulated evidence
16 implies low absolute risks and argues against important
17 teratogenic effects associated with the most commonly used
18 antidepressant medications. Did I read that correctly?

19 A. You did.

20 Q. And there published peer review methodology led them to
21 these conclusions; correct?

22 A. Their main analysis led to their conclusions, yes.

23 Q. And their main analysis was the published peer reviewed
24 analysis; correct?

25 A. Correct. And that's the analysis that you agreed my

1 paused analysis does not supplant or supersede in any way. It
2 add to it rather than supersedes it in my view.

3 Q. Understood. Doctor, I wanted to move on. Several
4 places in your report you refer to the word trend; correct?

5 A. Probably, yes, it's a word I use a bit.

6 Q. All right. And you use -- for example on page 4 of
7 your report so that's tab 176. Page 4 of your report you
8 refer to a trend when you're discussing nonsignificant
9 findings that you say in support increased risk; right? Let's
10 just take a look. No, that's not it. Page 4,
11 nonsignificant -- I think we're all having trouble reading
12 what we've got on our screens, Your Honor. I know I am.

13 THE COURT: Do you have -- Dr. Jewell's report
14 in binder that he has handy.

15 MS. YATES: You know what, I believe it's in --
16 good point. Thank you, Your Honor. It's in the binder from
17 yesterday I believe. Tab A from Mr. Zonies' binder.

18 THE WITNESS: I have it.

19 MS. YATES: You have it?

20 THE WITNESS: Yes.

21 MS. YATES: Tab 1, I'm sorry.

22 THE COURT: Tab 1.

23 MS. YATES: So if we go and it's now on the
24 screen I'm being told. Okay. I can't read that. So,
25 somebody's going to have to help me on that.

1 BY MS. YATES:

2 Q. You discussed, you used the word trend. We're looking
3 at page 4 of your report and you refer to result that reflect
4 statistically significant increased risk and nonsignificant
5 supporting trends in risks (positive associations); right?
6 That's one place where you use it in your report?

7 A. Yes. So, there I'm using it to say a positive
8 association, that's where I'm using the word, but it's not
9 statistically significant.

10 Q. Right. And you also use it when you discuss dose
11 response if we go to page 60 of your report you reference
12 trends in discussing an increased risk with dose with
13 increased risks; right?

14 A. Yes, the word is there being used a little bit
15 differently because it's in the context of a dose response
16 where a trend has its own meaning --

17 Q. Right.

18 A. -- that the risk goes up or down monotonically. And,
19 but again I'm using it there to point out that the evidence
20 from Huybrechts and Jimenez-Solem regarding dose response is
21 not statistically significant.

22 Q. Okay. You agree, sir, that there's no generally
23 accepted definition within the profession of biostatistics for
24 the word trend?

25 A. Not for the English word, no. I mean, I think it can

1 mean different things in different context as we just saw.

2 Q. Okay. And there's no textbook that defines trending
3 data; correct?

4 A. I would be shocked if there was.

5 Q. All right.

6 A. It's here being really used to point out the lack of
7 statistical significance, but yet a positive association.

8 Q. Okay. In fact trend is not a word you really like to
9 use is it doctor?

10 A. Why, I just said I kind of like the word, but you have
11 to give me a context. I guess there might be somewhere where
12 I don't like to I'm sure --

13 Q. All right.

14 A. -- I've said in the past in another context that I
15 don't like the word trend for a specific situation.

16 Q. Well, it looks like in Avandia you didn't like the word
17 trend?

18 A. Possibly. I would have to see the --

19 Q. Shall we look?

20 A. Sure. I would have to see the context.

21 Q. Okay. Let's -- you have the Avandia transcript, I
22 believe?

23 A. I do.

24 Q. Let's go to page 75 and turning over to 76, so it's
25 right at the end of 75 line 24 going over to page 76 line 14.

1 A. Seven, I'm sorry, 75, 76?

2 Q. Yes, 75, line 24.

3 A. Okay.

4 Q: There was some testimony about trends and then
5 I believe there was actually a question from the bench about
6 trends. I want to know is there textbook that defines
7 trending data.

8 A: No. I mean, as I said, I don't like that word.
9 I don't use it much, my -- I don't use it myself very much.
10 It's really kind of a loosely used word to say when you want
11 summarize a set of trials and say do they tend to have a
12 tendency to give a certain picture or not. Does it tend to be
13 a little bit red or a little bit blue? And so the trend there
14 is very informal, just saying do these trials have a tendency
15 or a trend towards being negative or positive with regard to a
16 comparison. That is the only way I've seen that word used.
17 It's not a word I use a lot myself.

18 Q. Did I read that correctly?

19 A. You read it correctly.

20 Q. Okay. Now, as part of your use of the word trend as
21 you said, you use that when you have nonstatistically
22 significant findings?

23 A. Yes, so that's a different context from the text you
24 just read from Avandia where it's not talking about that
25 situation.

1 Q. Right.

2 A. But if you want me to explain that I'm happy to do so.

3 Q. But my question that actually related to that was you
4 said you didn't like the word trend.

5 A. In that context and the context is described a little
6 bit there, but I could go into more detail, but it's different
7 from the way it's been used in that I -- the other two
8 examples you just gave.

9 Q. It depends on the situation?

10 A. Well, English words do tend to depend on the context
11 you're using them, yes.

12 Q. All right. But in Zolofit you use it for
13 nonstatistically significant findings; right?

14 A. In the dose response, yes. I use it in that context to
15 refer to non-significance?

16 Q. Let's separate out dose response for a doctor. Let's
17 focus on the nonstatistically findings, because you cite
18 several studies that "support" your trend; right? Support a
19 trend in increased risk?

20 A. Uh-huh.

21 Q. Yes? So let's start with Alwan 2007. You cite Alwan
22 and we can go to your report at pages 4 to 5. You support
23 Alwan finding a 1.3 odds ratio for conotruncal heart defects
24 as "support for an increased risk" correct?

25 A. I'm sorry, I'm not with where you are. You said 4 to

1 5.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. But I didn't get there quick enough.

4 Q. I'm sorry. I will wait.

5 A. Whereabouts on 4?

6 THE COURT: Your report.

7 THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm in my report on 4 and 5,
8 but I'm just not sure where you're reading from.

9 BY MS. YATES:

10 Q. Okay. Let's see if we can help you. All right. So
11 you say in your report page 4, the results that reflects
12 statistically significant increased risk and nonsignificant
13 supporting trend in risk positive associations for exposure
14 specifically to Zolofit include turn the page and you've got a
15 list of studies and their findings; right?

16 A. Yes, that list is as I indicated the list of all
17 nonstatistically significant results but which it indicated
18 increased in risk and that's the definition of that list.

19 Q. Right. And --

20 A. And Alwan is one of them.

21 Q. Alwan 2007 you have as showing supporting your trend in
22 increased risk, but let's go to Alwan, page 2684 and let's
23 take a look at the author's conclusion.

24 A. Okay.

25 Q. All right. So, here we have Dr. Jewell taken your

1 language from your report and we're going to go and look at
2 what the Alwan 2007 authors conclude; okay?

3 A. Yes, and we're on what page on Alwan?

4 Q. 2684.

5 A. Thank you.

6 Q. And they conclude maternal use of SSRIs during
7 pregnancy was not associated with significantly increased
8 risks of congenital heart defects or of most other categories
9 of birth defects; did I read that correctly?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And there peer review published methodology led them to
12 that conclusion; correct?

13 A. I assume.

14 Q. And you disagree with that conclusion?

15 A. Well, first of all they're talking about somewhat
16 different things, so on the left I'm talk -- which you haven't
17 noted on the slide, on the left I'm talking about Zoloft and
18 cardiac defects and in this case --

19 Q. Right.

20 A. -- you picked out the one which is conotruncal
21 subcategory of all cardiac. On the right-hand side the
22 authors are talking about their overall conclusion that --

23 Q. Right.

24 A. -- it is all SSRIs and I guess they're talking about
25 all cardiac --

1 Q. Right.

2 A. -- heart defects.

3 Q. So --

4 A. But you didn't put on the left-hand was the Alwan
5 result for Zoloft for all cardiac which is not in the list you
6 just put up.

7 Q. I'm going just with your report, right. So different
8 lists. Stick with me, I'm on that one --

9 A. Yes, but you're just comparing here two statements
10 about two different things that's all I'm pointing out.

11 Q. And I'm going to clear that up doctor.

12 A. Great.

13 Q. I went to your report, your list of nonstatistically
14 significant findings; right?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. Now we know that the authors of each and every study
17 doesn't make a concluding statement about every single
18 finding; right?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. That would be an awfully long study. So what we did
21 was she just showed a result that was nonstatistically
22 significant; correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. And all I'm trying to do is show the overall
25 conclusion, because you picked out various results from Alwan;

1 right?

2 A. No. I reported all of the results from Alwan that are
3 due to Zoloft and elsewhere in my report I give the number for
4 Alwan for all congenital heart defects that corresponds to
5 their conclusion on the right. Albeit theirs is for all
6 SSRIs.

7 Q. Okay.

8 A. So, we should probably go to my report if you want to
9 compare them and look at where did Alwan appear.

10 Q. Sure. All right. Let's look at that then doctor and
11 go to page 2691 table 3. You with me?

12 A. Yes, I'm with you in the Alwan paper.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Yes. Page 2691, table 3.

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. All right. Cardiac birth defects?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. For -- go to Sertraline which is Zoloft, number of
20 exposed 22. Odds ratio, adjusted odds ratio 0.7 confidence
21 intervals 0.4 to 1.3; did I read that correctly?

22 A. You did.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. Now that result is reported on page 12 as a result that
25 does not have a supporting trend to my opinion specifically.

1 So, that's why you cannot put those two sentences on the same
2 page, because where I do talk about the result that Alwan is
3 discussing, I have it in the right place in my report. It's
4 less than one, it does not provide a supporting trend, it's
5 quite explicitly clear on my report.

6 Q. I was coming to that. That's fine, I -- we went
7 straight to it, that fine. Let me see if I can move this
8 along, doctor. But if we go back to page -- just so we're
9 clear, if we go back to that list in your report, they are the
10 nonstatistically significant findings and you cite in addition
11 to Alwan you cite Kalen [ph], Maum [ph], and Luick [ph]
12 because they had some non-statistical findings, Colvin, I mean
13 there are multiple studies in other words and I just want to
14 be clear they're nonstatistically significant that fits into
15 your trend bucket.

16 A. This is the definition of this list is the list of all
17 the results in those core studies that show an increase in
18 risk, but, one that is not statistically significant for that
19 specific comparison.

20 Q. Understood.

21 MS. YATES: May I have a moment, Your Honor
22 because I may have just short-cutted something.

23 THE COURT: Sure.

24 BY MS. YATES:

25 Q. All right. Let's move to -- I'm going to come back to

1 that, I apologize, Your Honor. I'm trying to get organized
2 and apparently I'm not doing a very good job. Well let's go
3 to -- you're familiar with Maum 2011; right?

4 A. That is, yes, one of the studies.

5 Q. And we can again pull up your report page 4 to 5
6 doctor, if you have it?

7 A. I have it.

8 Q. You cite two nonsignificant findings from Maum as part
9 of your supporting trend in risk; is that right?

10 A. They are two positive associations there that are not
11 statistically significant; correct.

12 Q. Right. And that's conotruncal and --

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. -- transposition of the great arteries or TGA; is that
15 correct?

16 A. That is correct.

17 Q. And you recently testified in trial that the findings
18 in Maum for TGA is evidence that supports the claim that
19 Zolofit causes TGA; correct?

20 A. Well, that in the context of a lot longer discussion,
21 because for TGA specifically that's the only finding reported
22 in any of the studies we've discussed yesterday and today,
23 it's based on very few TGA cases, so this comes back to the
24 grouping discussion that when you go down to subgroups as rare
25 as TGAs you cannot possibly rely on that one single study in

1 isolation to prove causation. You can only rely on the fact
2 that it's contained in the larger group of all cardiac defects
3 where there is evidently an association.

4 Q. Sir, am I correct that you testified to a jury in
5 Philadelphia that based on that one reported case of TGA in
6 the Maum study that Zoloft causes TGA?

7 A. And that's the reason I just described, because as I've
8 already testified at deposition and was discussed at trial
9 that Maum finding is the only one reported for TGA. There are
10 very few TGA cases even in the Maum study that reports it. If
11 you only had that information in isolation you could not
12 really come to a conclusion of causation it's too much
13 variability, there's just -- you can see from the length of
14 the confidence interval there for TGA it stretches from .35 to
15 18.62 so there's just really very little precision, almost
16 none. So you have to fall back on the argument that we
17 discussed yesterday which is what I tried to explain to the
18 jury which is when you come to such a rare subcategory you
19 have to rely on its membership of a larger group where you
20 have established association.

21 Q. So, you've testified in that trial -- the birth defect
22 was TGA; right?

23 A. I think there was multiple birth defects, I was -- I
24 think I testified that I wasn't really that conscious of the
25 specific nature of the birth defects by that particular child,

1 suffered by particular child.

2 Q. Okay. And Maum to your recollection was the only study
3 that reported on the breakout that they actually reported on
4 TGA?

5 A. Yes, amongst those core studies in my report.

6 Q. Okay. And within Maum it was one case; right? One
7 reported case?

8 A. One exposed case, I believe.

9 Q. One exposed case; right? Okay.

10 A. There had to be some unexposed cases to gate an odds
11 ratio calculation that's as described.

12 Q. By women who didn't take Zoloft had children with TGA?

13 A. Yes, there were a huge number, more of them of course
14 is so there must have been at least one or two in there also,
15 but it's rare.

16 Q. And the Maum authors don't refer to this
17 nonstatistically significant finding in their conclusion as
18 one of the increased risk they found do they?

19 A. No, I don't remember, but I wouldn't be surprised if
20 they didn't because of the width of that confidence interval
21 as I described there's really in isolation there's no real
22 information. They reported it, but I would doubt they would
23 point it out in their conclusion section.

24 Q. Okay. They didn't point it out as a significant
25 finding; right? Because it wasn't statistically significant;

1 correct?

2 A. It's absolutely not statistically significant, yes.

3 Q. Okay. Doctor, the Colvin 2011 study that didn't
4 adjust, that didn't do any adjustment on the results did it?

5 A. You mean in terms of confounding?

6 Q. Right.

7 A. I'd have to go back and look at the paper, not all the
8 early papers were able to or did adjust for confounding, but I
9 don't recall specifically the details without going back and
10 looking.

11 Q. Okay. I can refresh your recollection with some
12 testimony.

13 A. Sure.

14 Q. Okay. Let's -- Prozac deposition. Doctor, I believe
15 this was a deposition taken in the Prozac case.

16 A. Thank you.

17 Q. If you would turn, sir, to page 170.

18 A. Page 170, yes.

19 Q. Line 14.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Okay. And --

22 Q: So, which of the 8 studies that did
23 adjustments?

24 A: Well now, I said before the break and relying
25 on memory so I would have to go back to each of them, but I

1 believe Alwan and Luick [ph] both did adjustment, I'm having a
2 hard time this is not the right place to look at this.

3 Mr. Zonies: Your report [indiscernible] the
4 witness is it in my report.

5 A: What page are you looking at?

6 Mr. Zonies: Page 14.

7 Q. Scroll down.

8 A: I knew I got it somewhere, but I just don't
9 remember these (reviewing document). Yes, the chart in my
10 report gives a -- this is what I did. So, you were talking
11 about sensitivity analysis. So there is the -- there were
12 actually not 8 in there, but Colvin I wasn't sure. I now
13 believe since I wrote the report that the fact that the study
14 adjusted odds ratio -- that the study adjusted odds ratio and
15 the odds ratio that Lilly used are identical and having reread
16 Colvin a number of times I don't believe they made any
17 adjustments. So you can ignore the Colvin on the chart on the
18 page 14, but the other 7 clearly there are 7 of them that did
19 Maum, Dealsitrin [ph], Cornum, Reese Kalen, Petersen Alwan and
20 Lloyd.

21 Q. Did I read that correctly?

22 A. You did.

23 Q. Does that refresh recollection, sir, that Colvin did
24 not adjust for confounding?

25 A. Yes. This is in terms of Prozac, but I assume the same

1 answer is true for Zoloft, they didn't do an adjustment for
2 confounding. If you actually turn to page 105 of the same
3 deposition which I'm sure you've read the whole thing, it says
4 on line 11 if I can read out, "and that's just" -- I'm talking
5 about misclassification, and then so, that's one of the issues
6 that's there, confounding by other factors is an issue for
7 some other studies, because we only have unadjusted results, I
8 don't throw those out either. I don't throw any of the
9 studies out as it happens. So there I'm pointing out that
10 there are some of the studies where only unadjusted results
11 are provided and that's all I have.

12 Q. Right. And my next question was going to be that's in
13 relation to Prozac, but you assume that that's also true for
14 the data on Zoloft. We have no reason to disagree with that?

15 A. Sitting here today I would assume that, yes.

16 Q. So, if your forest plot only includes studies that were
17 adjusted for confounding Colvin should not be on there; right?

18 A. Well, I think I was trying to put on the visualization
19 all of the results that were there, unadjusted or not, but
20 every time there was an adjustment I wanted to put in the
21 adjusted result.

22 Q. Right.

23 A. That's what I believe that visualization tells us.

24 Q. Okay. So if you had said that the forest plot only
25 contained adjusted findings that would be wrong?

1 A. For Colvin it would be wrong, yes, because we've just
2 determined it's one of the few if maybe the only that has
3 completely unadjusted results according to what you just read
4 to me.

5 Q. Okay. All right. Doctor, we mentioned the word trend
6 in relation to dose response and if we turn to page 60 of your
7 report tab 110 you have a section entitled dose response;
8 right?

9 A. I do, it's one of the Bradford Hill criteria.

10 Q. Right. And you write the epidemiological evidence, can
11 you find that for me?

12 A. At the bottom maybe?

13 Q. Yes, it's on the epidemiological evidence. In some,
14 the epidemiological evidence with regard to dose response for
15 Zolofit and cardiovascular malformations specifically is
16 limited, however, the evidence that does exist shows a trend
17 towards an increasing risk with increased dosing. Did I read
18 that correctly?

19 A. You read that correctly.

20 Q. And the two studies you rely on if we go to, if we look
21 at those citations 131 and 132 are actually Jimenez-Solem and
22 Huybrechts; correct?

23 A. That is correct.

24 Q. All right. Well, let's look at what the scientists who
25 conducted the Jimenez-Solem study and the Huybrechts study

1 concluded about whether their studies found a dose response
2 relationship. Let's first go to Jimenez-Solem at page 5, I
3 think you have that doctor.

4 A. Jimenez-Solem, okay. Page --

5 Q. Five.

6 A. Five, okay. I'm there.

7 Q. Right. The author states analyzing the effect.

8 Apparently my tech person can't read my mind. I don't know
9 why you don't know exactly where I am, Roger. Okay. Are you
10 with me doctor?

11 A. I see where you're starting to read from, yes.

12 Q. All right. Jimenez-Solem the authors state, analyzing
13 the effective dose is a continuous variable yielded no dose
14 response association. Did I read that correctly?

15 A. You did.

16 Q. And if we go to page 8 of Jimenez-Solem.

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. The authors state their conclusion regarding
19 confounding by indication are sustained by the lack of
20 relationship between dose and risk. Did I read that
21 correctly?

22 A. I said that, yes.

23 Q. All right. Let's move to Huybrechts.

24 A. If I can just stop for a second, because I want to
25 correct what you did and make it clear that everyone

1 understands the first paragraph you read from Jimenez-Solem
2 was not about Zolofit it was not about cardiac defects it was
3 about all malformations if I understand it correct late. And
4 though it says a sentence for individual major malformations
5 we found similar associations, but the two quoted odds ratios
6 are for major malformations and they actually are
7 contradictory to the dose response, they go down slightly
8 though it's statistically indistinguishable.

9 So, there's no question there that when you look at my
10 report you get the two odds ratios for low and high dose in
11 Jimenez-Solem which you didn't read which is 1.8 for the low
12 dose, odds ratio for Zolofit now specifically and specifically
13 for cardiac and for high dose it's 2.3.

14 Now, if we've learned anything in these last two days,
15 we should know by now you can't tell the difference
16 statistically with this level of data between 1.8 and 2.3, so
17 it's not statistically significant, but it is an increase
18 response as you increase the dose as reported specific in
19 Jimenez-Solem for those. It's just not statistically
20 significant. I have no disagreement there at all.

21 Q. Okay. And they don't refer to it in their overall
22 statement where they're talking bigger than just the cardiac
23 this was sustained by the lack of relationship between dose
24 and risk; correct doctor?

25 A. Well, we've already talking about their conclusion and

1 since they're not starting from the conclusion that there is a
2 risk then it's hard to see how dose response would confirm
3 with conclusion of no risk or no increased risk, so that
4 doesn't surprise me they said that. The bottom line is as I
5 say in my report and as all the authors agree on the data on
6 dose response in the human studies is really extremely limited
7 and even the definition of high and low dose as reported by
8 the experts differs enormously between Jimenez-Solem and the
9 one you're just going to Huybrechts.

10 Q. Okay. Well, let's go to Huybrechts. Let's go to
11 Huybrechts page 2402.

12 A. I'm there.

13 Q. Okay. Huybrechts page 2402, we did not observe a dose
14 response relationship either with respect to the first dose or
15 with respect to the highest dose dispensed. Did I read that
16 correctly?

17 A. You read it correctly on the screen. I'm just trying
18 to locate -- oh, yes, I'm with you. Yes, you read it
19 correctly.

20 Q. Okay. All right. And then they have in parentheses
21 table S17 in the supplementary appendix; right?

22 A. They do refer to table S17.

23 Q. Okay.

24 A. And as again this is the same issue that arose with
25 Jimenez-Solem table S17 which is on page 31 has a number of

1 results including Paroxetine, Zoloft, Fluoxetine, TCAs, SNRIs
2 and so on. So, they're making a blanket statement there. In
3 my own report I only pulled out the Zoloft specific
4 information and specific for cardiac the odds ratio for low
5 dose according to Huybrechts associated with Zoloft as 1.1.
6 For what she refers to as medium dose it's 1.33, of course
7 again, there's no way that's going to be statistically
8 significant and no one claims it is and that's all it is, it's
9 just an association in the direction of a dose response that
10 is not statistically significant nor would you expect it to be
11 with this size of data set.

12 Q. Understood. Doctor we've talked about a lot of studies
13 and despite my efforts to try and say that I don't need to
14 talk about anymore, my team seems to think I need to talk
15 about some more, but it's going to be focused on the issue of
16 confounding by indication which I know we've discussed a
17 little bit. But you agree that confounding by indication is a
18 particular concern in studies of depressed women; right?

19 A. It's a concern in all observational studies where the
20 outcome is a clinical condition, yes.

21 Q. Right.

22 A. Or is it -- sorry, let me rephrase that. When the
23 outcome is in a group of women or a group of individuals with
24 a clinical condition.

25 Q. Excuse me, sorry. And there are different methods by

1 which investigators can attempt to minimize confounding by
2 indication; correct?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. And that's true in several of the more recent studies
5 that we've seen in Zoloft that they -- as size progress the
6 later studies attempt today employ these methods that were not
7 used in earlier studies; fair?

8 A. I think the, yes, the thing your referring to most
9 prominently is the thing we discussed yesterday which is to
10 use only depressed women with a diagnosis of depression for
11 all of the pregnancies those exposed to Zoloft or an SSRI or
12 those not exposed where prior studies in this chart often had
13 used all women in there and then worried that in fact it might
14 be that that was not comparing an effective comparison group.

15 Q. Right. And so let's go through some of the methods
16 that these scientists used to attempt to examine confounding
17 by indication. So, Jimenez-Solem 2012 attempted a new method
18 of examining confounding by indication by comparing SSRI users
19 to women who paused their use during pregnancy; right?

20 A. That was the way they tackled the issue; correct.

21 Q. Right. And in fact they commented on the prior studies
22 that the data was conflicting and that some of these and none
23 of them hadn't successfully managed to differentiate between
24 the consequences of the drugs themselves and the underlying
25 disease; right?

1 A. That was the concern, yes and it's been a consistent
2 concern throughout this literature.

3 Q. And Jimenez-Solem they did the nationwide study in
4 Denmark; right?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. And they focused on congenital heart defects in
7 comparing this paused group to look at, to account for special
8 characteristics of women using antidepressants?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. All right. And you agree, sir, that that's a step
11 forward in science; right?

12 A. I think attempts to adjust for bias or control for bias
13 are always a step forward, yes.

14 Q. Let's look at another one. Ban [ph] 2014, right? I
15 know I --

16 A. I didn't know what the question was, sorry.

17 Q. Sorry. Ban was in 2014, wasn't it doctor?

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. If I get specific I'm sort of going to do what I just
20 did with Jimenez-Solem but if we need to go to the actual
21 study we can do that?

22 A. Oh, you don't need it, okay. Well, then I take your
23 word for it that it was 2014. It sounds right to me.

24 Q. Okay. Ban control for depression by comparing women
25 with depression who are taking SSRIs and to those who are

1 depressed who are not taking medicines; right?

2 A. I'd have to go back to the paper, but that sounds
3 familiar.

4 Q. Does that sound right?

5 A. But if we want to be exact we should look at the paper.

6 Q. All right. Can we find that quickly?

7 A. Sure.

8 Q. Sure. Who said sure?

9 A. I'm getting good at it now. I have it.

10 Q. You have it?

11 A. I do.

12 Q. Excellent.

13 A. And you're absolutely right. It is 2014.

14 Q. There you go. And just to confirm they, the study
15 control for depression by comparing women with depression who
16 were taking SSRIs and those with depression who were
17 unmedicated; right?

18 A. Well, that I would have to get into the text a little
19 bit to confirm my memory.

20 Q. Right.

21 A. Do you want me to do that or wait?

22 Q. I would like you to either take my word or confirm.

23 A. I'm happy to take your word at this point, because I'm
24 sure someone will point out if you're wrong.

25 Q. I'm sure they will. Doctor can key agree that this Ban

1 is the first study to do that type of depression restricted
2 comparison certainly when we're talking about Zoloft and the
3 SSRIs?

4 A. Again, without having to look at all the studies, I'm
5 perfectly willing to take your word, that was the first of the
6 10 to a dozen or so studies that started to use that approach.

7 Q. Okay. And this is another study that you cite of
8 evidence of an increased risk between Zoloft and cardiac birth
9 defects, right? Page 24 of your report.

10 A. Okay. This is for the all cardiac, it's a
11 nonsignificant positive association; that is correct.

12 Q. Okay. And if we apply their depression restricted
13 comparison and look at their conclusion, so if you go to Ban
14 page 1, abstract conclusions, are you with me doctor?

15 A. Yes. Well, I'm not where -- if you tell me a page
16 number it helps.

17 Q. Sorry, it is the front page, page 1?

18 A. Okay.

19 Q. They're conclusion, overall MCA, and that's major
20 congenital anomaly, again, that's bigger than cardiac and
21 subcategories; right?

22 A. It is.

23 Q. Risk did not increase with maternal depression or with
24 antidepressant prescriptions. Paroxetine was associated with
25 increases of heart anomalies although this could represent a

1 chance finding from a large number of comparison under,
2 comparisons under taken. Did I read that correctly?

3 A. You did.

4 Q. So based on their depression restricted methodology
5 that they employed to help counter this confounding problem
6 for cardiac, for heart anomalies they found no increased risk
7 accept Paroxetine which is Paxil; correct?

8 A. Yes, I think they're pulling out the significant result
9 then. We've had a lot of discussion that in an individual
10 study they're not going to, in isolation, they're not going to
11 report an increased risk of what was it 39 percent unless its
12 significant and they didn't and that would be consistent with
13 what we discussed this morning in the New England journal for
14 example.

15 Q. All right. Let's turn to very quickly again, just on
16 the issue of confounding, Huybrechts 2014 done by Harvard
17 Medical School; right?

18 A. Brigham and Young I think at Harvard.

19 Q. At Harvard, yes. Largest study of SSRIs and Zoloft to
20 date. Nearly a million women.

21 A. I can't remember Furu.

22 Q. Furu was 2.3 million?

23 A. Furu I think had more women, yes.

24 Q. Okay. So, this one would be the largest U.S.?

25 A. It's certainly the largest U.S., yes.

1 Q. Okay. Over 14,000 women exposed to Zoloft?

2 A. Gen, I can't remember these numbers, but if you have
3 them there or I can take your word for it, but.

4 Q. Okay. If I say anything that you want to verify doctor
5 or troubles you will stop and look at the study, okay? But
6 it's 2, page 2,402, table 2?

7 A. Yes, just the way I work is I tend to like to look at
8 the original information.

9 Q. That's fine. So there we have it, table 2, Sertraline,
10 14,000 women.

11 A. Yes, I see that now, thank you.

12 Q. All right. So, similar to the Ban study one step of
13 the analysis that was performed by the investigators of the
14 Huybrechts study was to do an adjustment made just for
15 depression; right?

16 A. Yes, they originally had more pregnancies, more mothers
17 in their data set then depressed mothers and then they
18 subsequently restricted the comparison group and actually the
19 Zoloft exposed group because not everyone taking Zoloft has a
20 diagnosis of depression. They restricted the comparison to
21 just those mothers with a diagnosis of depression.

22 Q. Right, so they had a depression restricted analysis
23 comparing depressed women who took Zoloft and depressed women
24 who were unmedicated?

25 A. Yes, were depressed means a diagnosis of depression.

1 Q. Right.

2 A. Cause it's --

3 Q. And limiting the results to that analysis of the
4 depression restricted cohort is yielded a nonsignificant odds
5 ratio. Well, let's turn to it. Page 2403 figure 1, doctor.
6 Sorry, I didn't want to get ahead of you.

7 A. That's okay. Figure 1, yes.

8 Q. Okay. So, when you limit the results to the analysis
9 of the depression restricted cohort it yielded a
10 nonsignificant odds ratio of 1.16 confidence intervals .95 to
11 1.41 and that's for Zoloft and cardiac defects; correct?

12 A. That's correct. And that's a change from the
13 unadjusted the full analysis which of course used a lot more
14 women which was 1.24. That happened to be statistically
15 significant, I didn't report it as that in my report because I
16 wanted to use --

17 Q. The adjusted.

18 A. -- the most extreme form of adjustment that the authors
19 reported. But that effect of restricting to the women who had
20 a diagnoses of depression in both exposed and unexposed groups
21 changed the odds ratio from one, for Sertraline from 1.27 if I
22 am looking correctly to 1.16, so roughly a 10 percent drop in
23 the odds ratio. So that gives you a sense which is I think
24 helpful in a courtroom or helpful in lay readers, that gives
25 you a sense of how big an impact would it be to do that kind

1 of adjustment for confounding by indication. If we would go
2 back to Colvin now, who you said or some of the earlier ones
3 who you said didn't do that adjustment because they didn't
4 have the data or dint think of the idea that way, I have not
5 put this in my report, but then you can think well, what
6 would've been the impact, this is the way a statistician
7 thinks. What would've been the impact if Colvin had done
8 that?

9 Well, the best evidence we have is it will do something
10 like it did in Huybrechts. It will change it by 10 percent.
11 That's what I comment in my report that the effect of
12 confounding by indication when you do this particular solution
13 is important but not enormous and dramatic, it changes the
14 odds ratio by 10 percent, 9 percent, I need to be exact.

15 Q. And that depression restricted analysis, that's not the
16 end of the Huybrechts analysis; right? They also performed a
17 propensity score?

18 A. Yes, but that propensity score now has less to do with
19 confounding by indication and more to do with general
20 confounding by other facts as we discussed yesterday.

21 Q. Okay. So, first step and then they did the second step
22 which was more to do with less specific confounding concerns?

23 A. Other variables other than diagnosis of depression,
24 yes.

25 Q. All right.

1 A. Obesity, maternal age, things like that.

2 Q. Now doctor I really don't know how to pronounce this,
3 I'm told Wemacher [ph], Wemaker [ph].

4 A. I know the paper you referring to.

5 Q. Okay. I'll try and, I'm told it's Wemacher, but --

6 A. This is the WHO study?

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. That's -- the authors conclude in that paper, they also
10 make a comparison, strike that. In the Wemacher paper they
11 note this issue of confounding by depression; do you recall
12 that?

13 A. I'm sure they did, yes, this is a very recent paper.

14 Q. All right. And in fact if we just take a quick look at
15 it. If you go to Wemacher, Wemacher, let's take a look at
16 page 8, the second paragraph. Actually Wemacher page 8 the
17 bottom of the first paragraph, sorry, oh, yes, you have it.
18 You are ahead of me.

19 A. I have the paper. I'm at page 8, yes. The pages
20 aren't numbered in the binder that's --

21 THE COURT: So, it's up to discussion?

22 THE WITNESS: It's discussion section, yes.

23 MS. YATES: Yes, sorry.

24 BY MS. YATES:

25 Q. It says, our finding of nonspecificity by SSRI type is

1 compatible with a mechanism of teratogenic agent being one
2 that is common to all SSRIs and is also compatible with
3 confounding by depression as indication -- depression as
4 indication or other associated factors or exposers. Did I
5 read that correctly?

6 A. You read it correctly.

7 Q. And then they go on to actually cite if we go to the
8 second paragraph the very three studies we just discussed;
9 right? Jimenez-Solem, Ban, and Huybrechts?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. And they say recent studies paragraph 2. Recent
12 studies have suggested that the association between SSRI and
13 CHD may be explained by confounding. Did I read that
14 correctly?

15 A. That's what they wrote, yes.

16 Q. All right.

17 A. Now, of course if you continue down the paragraph they
18 come back into this discussion about confounding by
19 indication. If you move over in your highlighter to the start
20 of the first paragraph on the right column, they say further
21 investigation of the hypothesis that the causal association is
22 with the underlying depression as necessary taking into
23 account the specificity we find in relation to types of CHD
24 and other CA, congenital abnormality. The evidence that
25 maternal depression increases congenital anomaly risk is

1 lacking. So, that link being missing undercuts the
2 confounding by indication argument, because you would need to
3 have a demonstrated association that being depressed increased
4 the risk of these specific birth defects.

5 Q. Okay. But you agree that the researchers should be
6 looking at this confounding by indication, that's important,
7 right?

8 A. Yes, absolutely --

9 Q. And in fact some of the earlier studies, you know,
10 Petersen, Cornum, they made statements they were concerned and
11 they addressed the issue that our results could be due to
12 confounding; right?

13 A. And particularly confounding by indication, yes.

14 Q. Right. And then we get these later studies that say,
15 well, let's look at that; fair?

16 A. That is correct. And we saw from Huybrechts when she
17 adjusted that and 1 attempt by restricting to women with a
18 depression diagnoses that the odds ratio did overstate when
19 you ignored it by about 10 percent, so that's what we see.
20 That's the best evidence we have to date in as you said the
21 largest U.S. study about the impact of confounding by
22 indication. Now, confounding in general can often annihilate
23 an odds ratio can take it from 2 to .5 if you get a strong
24 enough confounder so there's -- confounding by indication is
25 important you ought to deal with it as best you can, but it

1 doesn't as yet as far as we know it doesn't have a major
2 impact. It reduces the odds ratio down by about 9 percent and
3 then other confounders also reduce the odds ratio down a
4 little bit as demonstrated by Huybrechts but again, not very
5 much. Almost statistically indistinguishable. In fact if you
6 read my text I'll say we tend to ignore confounding
7 adjustments that are less than 10 percent, because there's
8 noise associated with doing that statistically, so you have to
9 put it in context of how big is the impact of confounding by
10 indication?

11 Q. So, are you saying that you can take the result from
12 one study where you see a 10 percent reduction due to
13 confounding and just say, oh, it's going to be 10 percent and
14 the other studies that had other study population, other
15 criteria, are you saying that?

16 A. No, not exactly. I said, I didn't put that in my
17 report. I put in that if you wanted as a statistician, if
18 somebody came to me now as you're sort of hinting at and said
19 Colwin didn't adjust for confounding, well, that could make a
20 big impact, I agree, it could, just if I knew nothing else.

21 So, I go to another population where they adjusted for
22 these confounding factors if it changed by 9 percent, I would
23 imagine since that confounding adjustment is based on the
24 association of the confounder with the outcome so let's say
25 smoking, it's saying how much does smoking increase the risk

1 of a congenital cardiac birth defect, and it also is based on
2 the association between -- that we would assume it doesn't
3 change that much from population to population. And we would
4 also -- it's based on the relationship between smoking and the
5 exposure to Zolofit for example. How much more, how -- are
6 Zolofit exposed women more likely to be smokers or not. That
7 could change from population.

8 Q. Right.

9 A. But the other one probably wouldn't, so a statistician
10 knows from doing simulations and computation that we alluded
11 to yesterday how much of an impact could you take -- get from
12 adjusting for confounding even though in this particular
13 population we around able to do it. It's not a definitive
14 result.

15 Q. Right.

16 A. It's just a sense of scaling. Are we talking about an
17 odds ratio 1.9 going to 1? All I'm saying is no. That would
18 demonstratively be different from what the published
19 literature shows us about the impact of adjusting for
20 confounding by indication. And for confounding by indication
21 as we've just said, its predicated on the idea that depressed
22 women have an increased risk of cardiac defects which is the
23 Wemacher paper we just read, there is no evidence of that, so
24 then you would say, well, the little bit, it's not surprising
25 that Huybrechts only found a little change in the odds ratio

1 when she adjusted for confounding by indication.

2 Q. I'm not going to go back to those studies. Let's
3 switch topics. Doctor, you referenced a Pfizer internal
4 e-mail from April, I think April 7, 2014, do you remember
5 that?

6 A. I think there was an internal e-mail that came out at
7 the time of the Frye hearing and also at some, the periodic
8 safety update report and then subsequently some updates of
9 that, that's my vague memory.

10 Q. Okay. Doctor let me focus you. I think yesterday you
11 mentioned an e-mail from April 2014; do you remember that?

12 A. Well, it's fine if you want to put it up, that would be
13 great to refresh my memory.

14 Q. Well, let me just see if I -- it was from Dr.
15 Katsopolis [ph].

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. Okay. And it was part of that literature review that
18 was ongoing.

19 A. Yes, that she was doing, yes.

20 Q. Doctor, you're not relying on those internal Pfizer
21 documents to form the bases of your opinions; correct?

22 A. No. As I testified yesterday directly to Mr. Zonies I
23 didn't actually see those documents until my report has been
24 written.

25 Q. All right. And you now know that that e-mail was part

1 of the beginning of a review and you ultimately when you saw
2 the final conclusion you disagreed with Pfizer's conclusion of
3 no increased risk; right?

4 A. I do.

5 Q. Okay. And you know that that was a part of a back and
6 forth with the FDA and reviewing the literature and it took
7 several months to compile; correct?

8 A. I don't really know the internal details of how Pfizer
9 was corresponding with the FDA about the issue.

10 Q. All right. Let's go to your forest plot sir, and the
11 current one that you showed in court my guess is --

12 A. That's the one that was blown up today? Okay.

13 Q. This is --

14 A. Okay. So that's, that one.

15 Q. Blown up and I'm going to, had my team is going to
16 watch me make a complete [indiscernible] of myself?

17 A. Finally a gentleman rises to his feet.

18 THE COURT: You can get away where saying that I
19 can't.

20 THE WITNESS: I'm just the statistician.

21 THE COURT: Since I have two of these lovely
22 blowups, I'm going to give one to the witness.

23 THE WITNESS: Thank you. Thank you very much, I
24 really appreciate it.

25 THE COURT: I think that's even easier than

1 looking at that?

2 MS. YATES: I think it might be. Thank you Your
3 Honor.

4 THE COURT: I will take the one that is sitting
5 on the desk, thank you.

6 BY MS. YATES:

7 Q. All right. So, doctor, just to orient us here, we have
8 at the top the statistically significant findings and they're
9 in red; right?

10 A. Correct.

11 Q. Okay. And we've got Berard 2015 on there, but there's
12 certainly some question about Dr. Berard findings; right?

13 A. In your mind, yes. As I pointed out at deliberate
14 length yesterday. I see no reason at this point to put her
15 findings on any different footing than any other, because I
16 understand the method she used, no one else seems to, but I
17 do.

18 Q. Okay. All right.

19 A. So, I wouldn't circle it in red and take it out. So,
20 if you can erase that that would be helpful.

21 Q. My circle doesn't mean I'm taking it out?

22 A. Oh.

23 Q. I was just talking about it.

24 A. Okay.

25 Q. Berard's finding is all septal; right?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. All septal was the result that we debated based on her
3 abstract in 2013 using the same method has a nonstatistically
4 significant finding and her published result using the same
5 method according to her own documents has now a statistically
6 significant, we debated that this morning; right doctor?

7 A. Yes, and that description of it is a little inaccurate,
8 it all hinges on using the correct statistical analysis
9 approach and you would expect the results to be different.

10 Q. Even using the same method twice?

11 A. No. If you use the same method, but in the published
12 paper I don't compare with the abstract, because if we'd start
13 using abstracts then the Laweek abstract has a significant
14 odds ratio for all septals. So if you want to go to abstracts
15 let's bring the Laweek one out, but I would prefer to stick to
16 the published peer reviewed paper finding and their
17 discrepancy that we debated can be explained by her
18 explanation that's as written in the paper is this use of this
19 required additional statistical software method.

20 Q. Okay. Even though she says she also used that in the
21 abstract?

22 A. Well, let's going back to want abstract. So I prefer
23 to stick to something that went through the peer review
24 process. I change papers during the peer review process
25 myself as reviewers point things out, so I would prefer to

1 stick just to the published, otherwise, I say, we bring in
2 Laweek's abstract.

3 Q. And as you said, you can't verifier it, we're taking
4 Dr. Berard's word?

5 A. Well, I can't --

6 Q. We're going by what's in the paper and Dr. Berard's
7 word?

8 A. I can't actually verify any of the numbers on those, on
9 that chart --

10 Q. Okay. All right.

11 A. -- personally.

12 Q. So, if we also look at your statistically significant
13 findings seven of them are Danish studies; right? So we have
14 Jimenez-Solem, Cornum, Petersen. Jimenez-Solem, Cornum,
15 Jimenez-Solem, Jimenez-Solem; right?

16 A. These are the Danish studies; correct.

17 Q. All right. So, seven. Seven Danish. And let's look
18 at all cardiac.

19 A. Well, do you want to point out there that there's one
20 American, one Australian, and one Canadian.

21 Q. Not really. Not really.

22 A. Okay. Then I'm just --

23 Q. I'm going to Denmark right now.

24 A. Okay. Oh, I see, you're just focusing on the Danish
25 studies, okay.

1 Q. Yes. Just --

2 A. Okay.

3 Q. Let's look at all cardiac, doctor. All cardiac is also
4 only Denmark studies that's Cornum and Jimenez-Solem; right?

5 A. They're both the Danish studies, yes.

6 Q. Okay. And if we go to let's see, here severe CHD
7 Wemacher.

8 A. That's there.

9 Q. Right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. That's the object severe CHD; right?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Wemacher, Epstein's anomaly; right?

14 A. Right. The severe CHD which is a subset of looking at
15 very severe cardiac birth defects wasn't reported by any of
16 the other authors though some of them talk about doing that
17 analysis.

18 Q. And Wemacher actually had an all cardiac.

19 A. Its right there in front of you where you're pen is.

20 Q. Right?

21 A. Yes. There it is.

22 Q. And that was not statistically significant; right?

23 A. That is correct.

24 Q. Okay. And let's stick with our statistically
25 significant. Colvin and we now know that was not adjusted but

1 that had others congenital anomalies of the heart; right?

2 A. Yes. And that has an odds ratio of 3.8, so that's
3 where the discussion about the un-adjustment [ph] is important
4 because if you think about a 10 percent change in that odds
5 ratio that would bring it down to 2.7. It would not influence
6 the significance nor really the impact of that study.

7 Q. Well, actually doctor, you said 3.8, it's 3.08?

8 A. Sorry, 3.08 yes.

9 Q. Yes. And then that leaves us with Berard that we
10 already discussed; right?

11 A. Correct. Berard has a significant result for all
12 septal.

13 Q. All septal. And previously where did Luick go? Luick
14 all septal used to be in that category; right?

15 A. Yes. So, I moved it down because of the change that
16 we've discussed at length of the left-hand confidence to
17 include 1.0.

18 Q. And Berard on the all septal finding has replaced
19 Luick, that's it. That's [indiscernible]?

20 A. I wouldn't say it's replaced it. It came in as a
21 different paper, but Luick had to move down because of that
22 change.

23 Q. On your chart?

24 A. On my, on this visualization, yes.

25 Q. Right. And I counted 59 total entries on that forest

1 plot, sir.

2 A. There are, that's the number 59 at the top.

3 Q. 59, right?

4 A. Uh-huh.

5 Q. And out of 59, 48 are not statistically significant?

6 A. That is correct. That's apparent from the colors on
7 the visualization. Only the red ones are statistically
8 significant at the upper right-hand corner.

9 Q. And you will agree sir, that most of the studies that
10 are represented on the forest plot are repeated multiple
11 times?

12 A. Well, of course, they're repeated because that
13 particular visualization as I indicated yesterday contains not
14 only all cardiac, but also all reported subcategories of
15 cardiac, and so the same studies are repeated as you've
16 pointed out.

17 And also it contains the overlapping studies as we
18 discussed both yesterday and today which partially overlap
19 with regard to the Danish that they completely overlap in
20 regards to one of the American studies the Alwan and Rufhaus
21 [ph] and the Swedish, the Reese Collen [ph] and Collen
22 studies. So yes, it's just a visualization.

23 Q. Okay. Now doctor while you've in terms of
24 observational studies you agree, doctor, that there are
25 typically some limitations and caveats with respect to the

1 data?

2 A. That is correct.

3 Q. And you agree that it's good practice to reflect the
4 necessary caveats when presenting the data; right?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. You wouldn't want to overstate a case that you're
7 making against a medicine; right?

8 A. No, I try to be as conservative actually.

9 Q. All right. And particularly when you're serving as an
10 expert in litigation; right?

11 A. Actually I don't make any difference to my methodology
12 when I'm working at Berkeley or working here.

13 Q. All right. But you actually have been accused of
14 overstating the case in the medical literature about a drug in
15 which you were testifying as a paid expert; right?

16 A. Are you referring to the Statin case?

17 Q. Yes?

18 A. Well, actually I haven't testified yet. I filed a
19 report about statin, yes, but this paper was actually
20 unrelated to the litigation work, but so they are unrelated.
21 I did of course disclose the fact that I was working on
22 Statin's for a separate reason when I wrote the article for
23 the British Medical Journal.

24 Q. And you disclosed your competing interest, right on
25 that paper?

1 A. I did.

2 Q. And you published an article in the British Medical
3 Journal entitled Should People at Low Risk of Cardiovascular
4 Disease Take a Statin; right?

5 A. I did with some co-authors, yes.

6 Q. Right. Yes, John D. Abramson is the first author?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. And then published the paper in October 22, 2013 if you
9 remember?

10 A. I don't remember the date, but it was roughly around
11 then, yes.

12 Q. All right. And at that time you made the appropriate
13 disclosure because you were an expert working with plaintiff
14 lawyers in the statin litigation; right?

15 A. I had been engaged. At that point I hadn't written any
16 reports. I now have written some reports on statins.

17 Q. And do you recall that about four days after your
18 article a response was submitted to the journal raising
19 concerns about your interpretation of the data?

20 A. I certainly do remember.

21 Q. Dr. Emmerit Decar [ph]?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. All right. And Dr. Decar said one of the points in
24 your article was not conclusively backed up by the details
25 evidence and references presented; correct?

1 A. That's what he claimed, yes.

2 Q. And he said do not overstate the case against statin,
3 sir; didn't he?

4 A. He may have. There were, I think several hundred
5 comments on that paper, so I don't remember each one of them
6 verbatim. I'm sure you've found the interesting ones.

7 Q. The bottom line, sir, after some back and forth and at
8 first you disagreed that you'd overstated the case, you
9 actually withdrew a statement from the article; correct?

10 A. We modified it, we corrected a statement in the
11 article, yes. And I can certainly explain the statement if
12 you would like, because there's been some very recent writings
13 that will bear on that if you wish.

14 Q. And in your correction you stated that your article did
15 not reflect necessary caveats and did not take sufficient
16 account of the uncontrolled nature of the study; right?

17 A. Yes. That was the key issue that the reporting of
18 certain side effects associated with all statins. I don't
19 want to alert, upset the Pfizer Lipitor people in the room,
20 but all statins -- the number we refer to which was from the
21 published peer reviewed literature was a number that did not
22 come from a controlled study and in reflection when people
23 called us on that we thought it better to point that out as a
24 limitation of that figure.

25 Q. So, you were accused of overstating the case against

1 statins. You corrected your paper in response?

2 A. We didn't correct the overstatement, the number, I
3 think it was 19 percent of people on statins suffer from some
4 form of myopathy, you'd have to go back to be absolutely
5 precise, so don't quote me.

6 That was coming from a published paper where it said 19
7 per or something like that. But we didn't make it clear
8 enough to the reader which we regretted and corrected that
9 that was an uncontrolled study so it wasn't like a controlled
10 clinical trial with people not on statins. So, maybe that
11 number is too high. I do want to say and there was a big
12 investigation of it and that correction was judged by the
13 journal to be perfectly adequate.

14 The New York City Times on Sunday published the number
15 of people on statins, I'm not claiming the New York Times is
16 the New England Journal, but they published a figure saying
17 that 25 percent of people on statins suffer from some form of
18 myopathy or muscle pain.

19 So the issue here was bringing to the attention of the
20 reader that that number comes from an uncontrolled study, not
21 a controlled study. That was the paper we were referencing in
22 the literature.

23 Q. Right. The statement you withdrew was about the side
24 effects and the percentage they occurred in and it said, "The
25 article did not reflect necessary caveats and did not take

1 sufficient account of the uncontrolled nature of the study."

2 A. Yes, I just explained that was the caveat. The number
3 itself was not wrong. It was just that one might
4 over-interpret that without realizing it's coming from an
5 uncontrolled studies.

6 Q. Right. And in at least, certainly Dr. Decar's opinion
7 you overstated the case against statins based on an
8 uncontrolled study; right doctor?

9 A. That was his opinion, yes.

10 Q. Okay. Now, doctor, you are aware that there are
11 certain medical and scientific organizations who have either
12 put out position statements or prepared papers on Zoloft; that
13 is right?

14 A. Yes, and Mr. Cheffo I think summarized them very well
15 on his opening.

16 Q. Right. So, let's take a look at some of those. You
17 know, sir, that I think you learned about it in this hearing
18 that the FDA has just proposed some labeling; right?

19 A. Yes, I think Mr. Cheffo put that statement up on the
20 screen on his opening.

21 Q. Right. And the FDA relies on multiple, or refer to
22 multiple studies; right?

23 A. Well, if we could put the statement up, I think it
24 might be helpful to see what explicitly they said.

25 Q. Sure. Let's do that?

1 A. I think Mr. Cheffo put it up, so you should have it
2 right at hand.

3 Q. Let's go to FDA proposed label, tab 235, Roger, please.
4 And we're at page 11 to 12. And to be fair --

5 THE COURT: Is this in a binder.

6 MS. YATES: It might be, Your Honor. If it not
7 I can use the [indiscernible]. Let's do the [indiscernible].

8 MR. ZONIES: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
9 this line of questioning because it has nothing to do with
10 methodologies presumably we're going to see some conclusions
11 reached by these organizations and it has nothing to do with
12 Dr. Jewell's methodology, it's about conclusions. Unless
13 we're going to go into the methodologies of each of these and
14 compare those to Dr. Jewell's since I doubt we are and I hope
15 we're not.

16 And then secondly, this correspondence with the
17 FDA, we've requested from Pfizer the correspondence with the
18 FDA that led up to this proposed label, because IT may be just
19 Pfizer's proposal to the FDA and we don't know and if it's --
20 and we don't have that correspondence yet. Pfizer hasn't
21 provided that to us. And so --

22 THE COURT: All right. And I know this isn't
23 part of the report.

24 MR. ZONIES: And it's not part of the report.

25 THE COURT: Ms. Yates would you respond please

1 to why you are pursuing this course of questions.

2 MS. YATES: Yes. Dr. Jewell disagrees with
3 these organizations and our point is you can't follow a
4 reliable methodology and reach a different conclusion, because
5 everybody else is on the same page. So, I can do this very
6 quickly, Your Honor.

7 THE COURT: The methodologies you are referring
8 to that apparently he doesn't agree to how do we know that he
9 doesn't agree to them?

10 MS. YATES: Well, I think the point is the
11 [indiscernible] versus Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals case, Your
12 Honor. When I scientist claims to rely on a method practiced
13 by most scientists yet presents conclusions that are shared by
14 no other scientist, the District Court should be wary that the
15 method has not been faithfully applied.

16 So, while I -- all of these organizations looked
17 at the literature; right? I can't be more detailed in terms
18 of what they did, but several of them and I know Dr. Jewell
19 has criticisms of their methodologies, but their reached
20 certain conclusions based on those methodologies. Dr. Jewell
21 disagrees with them. And it is this very case that says, I
22 reviewed the literature, I rely on the literature, I conclude
23 X. You can't all going down the same road if everybody else
24 is on a different page.

25 THE COURT: But everybody else being on a

1 different path is a conclusion. How do I apply that to his
2 methodology?

3 MS. YATES: Because you can't get to Dr.
4 Jewell's conclusion if you have a reliable methodology.

5 THE COURT: And how are you going to present
6 that other than presenting these other scientists?

7 MS. YATES: I'm going to present these other
8 scientists' conclusions and argue it, Your Honor.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Zonies, you want respond?
10 You're still on your feet.

11 MR. ZONIES: Yes, that's the issue, Your Honor.
12 If Pfizer would like to bring the AHA in here and allow me to
13 cross-examine them on their methodology so we can understand
14 them and then compare their methods to Dr. Jewell's methods
15 I'm not averse to that, but this is essentially trying to use
16 a proxy out of court expert organization whom as we've showed
17 in opening, whom first of all Dr. Jewell does not rely upon,
18 because it's just a conclusion, the oldest conclusions a
19 single piece of paper, one page and based on two studies or
20 four studies. So, absent my being able to cross-examine them
21 on their methods and show how we believe them to be, but it's
22 speculation on our part, we believe them to be terrible
23 methods, it's really not relevant here.

24 That case is talking about the underlying
25 studies and making an examination of the studies and the

1 methodologies. It's not talking about whether or not the AHA
2 in a one-page paper or the Otis in a one-page paper reach a
3 different conclusion. We'll stipulate they reach a different
4 conclusion. There's no need to go through a whole process of
5 it, because that's all that's going to be shown is their --

6 THE COURT: All right. Just let me clarify,
7 because that makes sense to me. Let me clarify. Are each of
8 these proffered studies and organizations that reached
9 different conclusions based on different methodologies than
10 Dr. Jewell, did each of them comment or critique Dr. Jewell's
11 methodology and his report? In any of them?

12 MS. YATES: I doubt that -- not specifically,
13 no, Your Honor, I doubt they've heard of Dr. Jewell unless
14 they've read his EEG paper.

15 THE COURT: All right. So this is really the
16 classic issue. The battle of experts who are not here and
17 haven't submitted their work to be reviewed as Dr. Jewell's
18 have.

19 MS. YATES: Well, let me clarify one thing, the
20 FDA current thinking on our label is not peer reviewed all of
21 the others are peer reviewed and statements out there in the
22 medical and scientific community for doctors and practitioners
23 and ladies deciding whether to take this medicine during
24 pregnancy review and rely on. So they followed a methodology
25 that's Otis, Your Honor, it gives advice to patients. Their

1 methodologies have pursued peer review with the advice and
2 statements they are giving. That's in contrast to a
3 statistician who is in a courtroom and I think there's
4 courtroom versus peer review real world. And that the Court
5 should be aware of that.

6 THE COURT: But that's more argument than
7 anything else. It's not the evidence that counters the
8 statistician who's here before him. It's like putting up an
9 epidemiologist against a statistician. One have a better
10 conclusion than the other, but it's really about his area of
11 expertise if he is doing it in a reasonably applied way.

12 And the FDA labeling is a whole other part of
13 the case that we've never gotten into in discovery or anything
14 else. Labeling changes have a hierarchy and I went through
15 this in Avandia and a process that is foreign to most people
16 and it would be totally unfair to say FDA's going to do this
17 or has done this is. That's not what he wrote on.

18 MR. Cheffo: Your Honor, if I could just address
19 just a few quick things, because I think we may have gotten --
20 because I think there are a few different issues here. The
21 first is everyone, the whole point of what Dr. Jewell has told
22 us; right, is that he wishes he had a team. When he works in
23 the real world he has team. His team is study authors; right?

24 We don't have any of those people here; right?
25 So the nature of kind of what we're all doing here is we have

1 to rely --

2 THE COURT: Not to interrupt you Mr. Cheffo --

3 MR. CHEFFO: Sure.

4 THE COURT: All these studied authors are in the
5 record in terms of their materials, their studies and he's
6 explaining repeatedly so how he's utilized them or ignored
7 them.

8 MR. CHEFFO: And we -- and you're absolutely
9 right and the point I guess he is that he has taken what other
10 people's work is outside the courtroom where none of us can
11 take their depositions they're not here and the point is what
12 we're examining I believe and asking Your Honor to examine is
13 whether his methodology in reviews and analyzing that
14 independent peer review data meets the Daubert standards;
15 right?

16 So, what we're doing is looking at that and
17 we're looking at other organizations who are learned, who are
18 reliable, who've looked at that sim information and applied
19 the same methodology or a methodology and determined if it's
20 appropriate. So, where I think it's fair and this is exactly
21 I think what Your Honor did with respect to Dr. Berard too,
22 and I guess there's two other quick things.

23 THE COURT: But --

24 MR. CHEFFO: First is the --

25 THE COURT: I have not pass judgment as to the

1 standard of Daubert on any of the studies that have been
2 relied on in here, nor could I.

3 MR. CHEFFO: Agreed.

4 THE COURT: And how can I do the same with your
5 organizations, however great a reputation they may have.

6 MR. CHEFFO: Well, I think the issue is this is,
7 Your Honor, Daubert, one of the factors I'm going to show this
8 I think in one of the first slides; right? General acceptance
9 is not something that is required like it may be under
10 [indiscernible] Frye or [indiscernible] but it's certainly a
11 factor; right?

12 So, it's perfectly appropriate for Your Honor to
13 consider both from the Lusk [ph] decision and from Daubert and
14 it's progeny whether in fact these kinds of analysis, this
15 methodology is generally accepted. It's, again, it's not the
16 end all and be all, but it is certainly a relevant factor and
17 I would say the one thing about the FDA, the plaintiff's
18 started this story in a number of way, right? They put in and
19 they wanted to have and they've done this and in certain
20 hearings and at trial and in Dr. Jewell's report they took two
21 lines from or two entries from Dr. Katsopolis and then they
22 also took the PSURs. That was part of a story; right?
23 Essentially you remember from the opening, Your Honor, the FDA
24 asked for some information there was an initial review. There
25 was a subsequent amount of work for five or six months,

1 plaintiffs have got all this information. They've given all
2 of that information. Then ultimately Pfizer in response to
3 the FDA which was the beginning story was the documents that
4 they've relied on, Pfizer then submitted information in
5 January of 2015, all of that information has been given to
6 counsel, in fact we've told them that we've done searches for
7 any information between January and August.

8 Now, it's just I think by fortuity that the
9 hearing got moved to our knowledge and we're confirming this
10 with counsel and have told them this. There's been no other
11 back and back and forth that was the first information. We
12 got the information and within a very timely basis it was a
13 proposed labeling which you saw earlier that was given to
14 plaintiffs.

15 So this idea that they don't have the
16 information is not really accurate, but it's all again to the
17 point here, Your Honor, is that the story about whether you
18 can look at one little piece of the puzzle, the FDA has now
19 looked all the information. They have the same information
20 that Dr. Jewell does that everybody else does and they've
21 basically come back and said looking at that, here's what we
22 think the appropriate labeling is. So, I think it's
23 absolutely appropriate for Your Honor to consider it as part
24 of your Daubert analysis.

25 THE COURT: Let me hear from you Mr. Zonies on

1 the FDA.

2 MR. ZONIES: Yes, I mean, I'll read the e-mail
3 from Mr. Cheffo's colleague sent to me on the 27th. To follow
4 up on this, we have requested all correspondence back and
5 forth between the FDA and Pfizer that led up to this proposed
6 label, because we don't know whose proposal it is or what the
7 back and forth was and Mr. Lafadda [ph] sent me an e-mail on
8 the 27th saying to follow up on this. I estimate the
9 production from this file would go out late next week which is
10 after today so there appear to be documents according to Mr.
11 Lafadda, it's the first I've heard that there aren't and that
12 we're supposed to get those documents after the hearing today,
13 because we didn't think that necessarily because we believe
14 that this was not at all particularly relevant to Dr. Jewell's
15 methodology we didn't come to the Court and say, oh, we should
16 postpone, because this is what the FDA does or doesn't do
17 frankly in the context of a Daubert hearing about his methods
18 means very little in --

19 THE COURT: And to propose to question him on
20 the as yet proposed, but probably some change in a label
21 approved by the FDA or not seems to me to be throwing
22 hypotheticals out.

23 Now there's a certain amount of that you can do
24 in a Daubert hearing. But is this fair? And is it relevant
25 to my Daubert analysis if the FDA is changing the label now?

1 That nobody else on the plaintiff's team has dealt with yet.

2 MR. CHEFFO: Just to be clear on this, the FDA
3 is not -- that's the point the FDA is not changing the label.
4 The FDA is saying hey, we've looked at this it's a category C,
5 should there be something about the -- the plaintiff's whole
6 position has been, hey, Zolof's a teratogen, you should warn
7 that it causes birth defects.

8 The FDA's now looked at all of this information
9 and they've basically come and we can put those back up, I
10 know Your Honor probably saw those quickly, they're saying we
11 don't think there is a labeling change required. In fact,
12 we've looked at all the literature and there's no teratogen so
13 for the Court to basically not account for the fact that that
14 what Dr. Jewell is saying is against the entire of the world
15 and now the FDA is saying it seems to be absolutely relevant
16 for a Daubert analysis, because nobody is saying and it's not
17 unfair because they've -- we've got it the same time that
18 they've gotten it.

19 THE COURT: It's how you're doing this Mr.
20 Cheffo. It's the middle of the Daubert hearing, it's towards
21 the end of the Daubert hearing. And all of a sudden this
22 hasn't been briefed, this hasn't been really noticed in time.
23 We only extended the time here because of the Luick changes
24 and I'm really concerned about some kind of fairness. I want
25 all of the information out. This isn't accounted for in his

1 report from what I know.

2 So, the question is can you ask him in a Daubert
3 hearing about an FDA label change or refusal to change when
4 his findings don't happen to agree with Pfizer's?

5 MR. CHEFFO: I would just say this, Your Honor,
6 just in terms, because I hear you and I understand --

7 THE COURT: It's a hypothetical, really.

8 MR. CHEFFO: Well, I don't know that it's a
9 hypothetical to address the fairness point and again, I'm not
10 faulting counsel for this we specifically said, because this
11 was, you saw April 12th I think is the date of this we gave it
12 to counsel right after and we, or I'm sorry, August, thank
13 you. And we specifically -- the 14th, it could be. I have
14 my -- Verizon network is keeping me honest here.

15 And basically we said to the -- we gave it to
16 the PSE and we said hey, tell us now a week ago. Tell us now
17 if you want to go and tell Judge Rufe that you need more time
18 for this and if so we will do that. And I don't think there's
19 any dispute about that. And PSE said, no, we don't want more
20 time. So, they frankly have what we have. I did tell and
21 Paul Lafadda is looking if there is any additional
22 information, I've told them also, I'm not aware of it, it's
23 not like we have anymore. If we find it in files we will
24 produce it. And again if they want to supplement, if there's
25 something that they want to do that's fair. We're not trying

1 to basically pull a gotcha, but remember this is a process,
2 the FDA started, they asked March of 2014 then in September
3 and October there was a submission then in January. It's the
4 FDA that basically just on August 14th said we've look at the
5 information, we don't think that there should be any change.
6 And I think again for the purposes of evaluating whether it's
7 generally accepted -- is a methodology that finds that Zoloft
8 causes all birth defects consistent when the FDA says, hey,
9 don't change your label, that's something that we think that
10 Your Honor can and should evaluate as part of its decision.

11 THE COURT: There is much litigation about FDA
12 label, its adequacy and correctness and right now you're going
13 to try to ask an expert who has been called by an opposing
14 party to start testifies outside his report which would not be
15 allowed if Mr. Zonies tried to ask that question.

16 And that's a big problem to me. Where are you
17 going with this with all of the other as yet unnamed but some
18 of them have been named so-called authorities that allegedly
19 agree with the FDA, it's too much, it's too attenuated. FDA
20 may not be attenuated because that has been in the works, but
21 their conclusion hasn't been and I want to be fair here and
22 only elicit evidence that should be admissible.

23 Now, I think it's perfectly reasonable to say
24 here's the label it's not what your conclusion is can you
25 please explain the difference and how do you explain that

1 other people don't agree with you? I think that's okay. But
2 where I think Ms. Yates was lining things up was a whole list
3 of different methodologies that are going to be outside the
4 evidence in this case.

5 MS. YATES: I have a feeling Ms. Yates has a few
6 new questions to ask based on Your Honor's --

7 THE COURT: Well, you can summarize on what the
8 FDA is doing or not doing. If there's no agreement as to that
9 the premise of the question is going to elicit information I
10 can't use, testimony that I won't be able to use, but I don't
11 want to do this again.

12 So, can we come up with some context here that
13 says and I don't want to defer this. I don't think there
14 should be a deferral of my rulings or this particular issue on
15 the FDA. We better start getting all the evidence on the
16 record to get some conclusions drawn here, so we can move
17 forward whatever way that is.

18 Mr. Zonies, would your position change if the
19 questions posed were confined in any way to what the FDA is
20 currently doing?

21 MR. ZONIES: Well, again, Your Honor, that's the
22 foundational issue is in part. Our concern is this -- we
23 don't believe this was written by the FDA, we don't know if it
24 was. Is this Pfizer's proposal to the FDA that the FDA is
25 hasn't -- so, in your own words when Ms. Yates stands up and

1 says here's what the FDA's okay with, we don't know that;
2 right? Because it's not final so, if the question is about
3 that document, hey, this document says by the way that there
4 are some studies that show risk do you disagree with the
5 records in that document, I suppose that's fine, it's about
6 conclusions, but Dr. Jewell nor opposing counsel knows
7 anything about the methods used to reach that, so to the
8 extent that it's a -- it's some sort of affirmation that the
9 methods used in these various documents we're about to see are
10 the correct methods, it's impossible for Dr. Jewell to comment
11 on that.

12 THE COURT: Yes, I don't think there's a case
13 that's ever said that, because the FDA has said so that it's
14 correct. And I'm not criticizing the agency, we depend on
15 them every minute of every day in many facets of our daily
16 lives. But there is supposed to be a process here. I would
17 need to hear, you may need to do this overnight counsel and I
18 would need to know what precisely are the questions that are
19 going to be posed and where are the parameters of this line of
20 questions and I'd that postponed until tomorrow morning.
21 Right now I'd like you to move onto something else.

22 MS. YATES: Okay. Your Honor then we -- this
23 may be my last section, so if we could just take a brief
24 recess so that I can figure out if there's more for me to
25 cover today.

1 THE COURT: All right.

2 MS. YATES: That would be perfect.

3 THE COURT: That would be fine.

4 MS. YATES: Thank you, Your Honor.

5 THE COURT: We're in brief recess.

6 (Whereupon there was a recess in the
7 proceeding from 3:27 p.m. to 4:20 p.m.)

8 DEPUTY CLERK: All rise. Court is now in
9 session had Honorable Cynthia Rufe now presiding.

10 THE COURT: Good afternoon.

11 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Please be seated. Where are we
13 counsel? Does these courtroom feel like an obstacle course?

14 THE WITNESS: It does a little, yes.

15 THE COURT: Yes, in more ways than one.

16 THE WITNESS: I've noticed. I'm glad I'm a
17 statistician.

18 BY MS. YATES:

19 Q. I may have actually tripped over there or dropped
20 something, but anyway. Doctor we're almost done?

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. Okay? Where went to your -- do you recall doctor that
23 with your expert report you had a reliance list attached to
24 it?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Is that correct? And that should be in, I think tab 1
2 of the binder Mr. Zonies gave?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And if you go all the way to the back unfortunately,
5 it's in, I think alphabetical order. It says Zolofit label and
6 then you've Pfizer's website.

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. So that's -- it's correct to state sir, that you have
9 the Zolofit label on your reliance materials; correct?

10 A. Yes, I read the label at some point and I think I was
11 asked about at deposition and said no I had no expertise on
12 labeling or with the FDA.

13 Q. Right. You're not a regulatory expert; right doctor?

14 A. No.

15 Q. And we heard earlier today that in the hearing that in
16 fact you had asked the lawyers to submit your expert record to
17 the FDA; right?

18 A. Yes, that was a question at trial that I hadn't done
19 that and if I felt important enough about it I should and so I
20 asked them to do so. I was happy to be released to anyone,
21 actually.

22 Q. And we just found out that the lawyers have in fact
23 submitted your report to the FDA sometime back in June; do you
24 know that?

25 A. As I indicated I asked them verbally and they said they

1 had done it, but I didn't have anything in writing which is
2 what you asked me.

3 Q. Right. So with the label on your reliance list and
4 your report having been submitted I assume that you have some
5 interest in the current position or the current thinking of
6 the FDA and the language in the label?

7 A. I have interest in everyone's opinion on the issue.

8 Q. Okay. Well, let's look at the FDA's weren't proposed
9 language in the label; okay doctor and -- Your Honor I don't
10 believe that this was previous marked even though there were a
11 lot of submissions?

12 THE COURT: I don't think I've seen it.

13 MS. YATES: I'm going to mark it as Exhibit A.
14 Defense Exhibit A to the Daubert hearing if that's okay.

15 THE COURT: Yes.

16 MS. YATES: And we will get you copies or we
17 have copies and we will get you copies. Oh, there we go.

18 BY MS. YATES:

19 Q. So, doctor, just quickly, I just want to know when I
20 show you certain statements made by the FDA the current
21 proposed label whether you agree with them; okay?

22 Let's go to pregnancy risk summary. Doctor, overall --

23 A. Could you tell me the page number again?

24 Q. I'm so sorry.

25 A. That's okay.

1 Q. So, that's a very good question, so it's actually a
2 bates stamped page?

3 A. I can manage that.

4 Q. Can you do that, so 3744.

5 A. Okay. Now I'm there, thank you.

6 Q. Right at the bottom, doctor.

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Pregnancy risk summary.

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Last word on the page, overall. Okay? Overall
11 available published epidemiologic studies of pregnant women
12 exposed to Sertraline in the first trimester suggests no
13 difference in major birth defect risk compared to the
14 background rate for major birth defects in comparative
15 populations. I take it you disagree with that.

16 A. I -- no. I don't have an opinion about major birth
17 defects.

18 Q. Okay. Then we read on, some studies have reported
19 increase for specific major birth defects, however, these
20 studies are inconclusive, (see data). Do you have an
21 agreement or disagreement on that statement?

22 A. Well, it doesn't specifically mention that cardiac
23 birth defects are one of the specific ones there related to,
24 of course I would agree that some studies have reported
25 increases for cardiac birth defects, but they don't state that

1 explicitly so I can't really comment.

2 Q. All right. Let's move to page 3745; right? At the
3 bottom of the page, first trimester exposure.

4 A. Third -- first.

5 Q. First trimester exposure.

6 A. Oh, it starts and then it moves onto the next page.

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Okay. Are you with me?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Starting with the second sentence, "A meta-analysis of
12 studies suggests no increase in the risk of total
13 malformations summary odds ratio 1.01, 95 percent confidence
14 interval .88 to 1.17 or cardiac malformations (summary odds
15 ratio .93, 95 percent confidence intervals .70 to 1.23 among
16 offspring of women with first trimester exposure to
17 Sertraline.) Do you agree or disagree with that statement?

18 A. Well, that is actually just a descriptive sentence
19 about a meta-analysis. It's parent from Mr. Cheffo's slide
20 and from the numbers that is in fact referring to the Miles
21 meta-analysis as I've now testified at length, I do not
22 believe that the Miles meta-analysis gives an appropriate
23 summary of the available data on Zoloft and cardiac birth
24 defects and in specifically it reflects that the FDA in that
25 sentence has not reviewed all of the studies on Zoloft and

1 cardiac defects that I have reviewed so I would state it twice
2 in the arguments about this language that the FDA has reviewed
3 all of the studies.

4 The Miles meta-analysis you will recall only contained
5 five of the old studies on Zoloft and cardiac birth defects so
6 I don't disagree with the sentence that's what Miles says, but
7 as I've said many times now that is inconclusive or
8 inappropriate summary of the evidence for the reasons that
9 it's got a lot of heterogeneity masked by the averaging and
10 it's only covers five studies.

11 Q. Well, so just because the FDA references Miles for that
12 point doesn't mean that they haven't reviewed the other
13 studies.

14 MR. ZONIES: Your Honor, I just want to clarify
15 the record and this was one of my concerns that as the law
16 provides and as we all know the FDA, this is not the FDA's
17 label, this is Pfizer's label and so we keep and since Dr.
18 Jewell's not an expert in this, he may not know that this is
19 actually Pfizer's language and not the FDA's, so I just want
20 to be clear on that.

21 MS. YATES: No, I need to be very clear, Your
22 Honor. This is what came to Pfizer from the FDA. This is the
23 FDA's proposed language.

24 MR. ZONIES: This was my concern about not
25 having a foundational required -- if we could just say this

1 language in this proposed label and not attribute it to being
2 the FDA saying it I'm fine with that, because this is not the
3 FDA's language. The law makes it clear that the label is
4 Pfizer's label and they're responsible for it. That was my
5 only concern.

6 THE COURT: And will you accept that premise?

7 MS. YATES: I will.

8 THE COURT: Because I think it permits you to
9 continue this line of questions without the underlying
10 conclusion that the FDA has written this.

11 MS. YATES: Fair enough, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Thank you.

13 BY MS. YATES:

14 Q. Dr. Jewell just one more section of the label and then
15 it again deals with cardiac. Let's go to the next tab,
16 please, same page, doctor, right after where we were.

17 A. Yes, I'm with you.

18 Q. Okay. And increased risk of congenital cardiac defects
19 specifically septal defects the most common type of congenital
20 heart defect was observed in some published epidemiological
21 studies where first trimester Sertraline exposure, however
22 these studies were limited by the use of comparison
23 populations that did not allow for the control of confounders
24 such as the underlying depression which may be independently
25 associated with these malformations. I take it that you

1 disagree with that statement as well.

2 A. Well, I don't disagree that an increased risk has been
3 found in some published studies. I do agree that some studies
4 were limited by the inability to adjust for confounding my
5 indication, but some others were not and I do not believe it's
6 a fair summary of the entire data to say that the observed
7 increases in risk that are in all of the studies are washed
8 away by dealing with confounding by indication as I've
9 previously testify.

10 Q. Fair enough. Doctor, also on your reliance list is the
11 scientific statement by Denofrio et al.

12 A. Yes, I see that.

13 Q. And that's the scientific statement -- well let me just
14 give a little bit more detail it's from the American Heart
15 Association. Adults With Congenital Heart Disease Joint
16 Committee of the Council on Cardiovascular in the Young and
17 Council on Clinical Cardiology. Council on Cardiovascular
18 Surgery and Anesthesia and Council on Cardiovascular and
19 Stroke Nursing, the title is Diagnosis and Treatment of Fetal
20 Cardiac Disease: A Scientific Statement from the American
21 Heart Association, did I read that correctly?

22 A. You did.

23 Q. So, that scientific statement is on your reliance list
24 and you've been asked questions about that statement; right?

25 A. Yes, the Pfizer lawyers have ask me about that a couple

1 times.

2 Q. And you're critical of the fact that they only site to
3 two Zolofit related studies in that scientific statement;
4 correct?

5 A. That I can't recall I'd have to go back and look at the
6 statement to refresh my memory.

7 Q. Okay. Were you listening to Mr. Zonies, because I
8 think that's what he said?

9 A. I actually, my opinion doesn't, I don't listen to Mr.
10 Zonies for my opinions. I've tuned them out.

11 MR. ZONIES: Objection, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Overruled.

13 MS. YATES: I'm sorry, I think I have to end on
14 that, but I do have a couple more questions.

15 THE WITNESS: Okay.

16 MS. YATES: I timed that wrong.

17 BY MS. YATES:

18 Q. Doctor, you will agree that that statement, their
19 conclusion, you disagree with their conclusion?

20 A. I don't remember the conclusion. That was a -- what my
21 memory tells me was that was a statement about the treatment
22 of fetal cardiac disease and was dealing with the issue of
23 whether infants whose mothers were exposed to Zolofit should be
24 screened more heavily because of the concerns about the
25 potential risk of Zolofit increases certain kinds of birth

1 defects. That was my memory, but to say it, to be fair to it
2 if you really want to ask me questions we should look at it in
3 detail.

4 Q. Yes, I apologize, I was trying to short circuit. Let's
5 go to the AAHA page 8, please and just take a quick look at
6 the results.

7 A. When is that?

8 Q. That is a very good question. That is, I don't know if
9 it's in your binder.

10 THE COURT: It's in your binder.

11 MS. YATES: It should be. [Indiscernible].

12 THE COURT: Number one. That is in Pfizer's
13 binder.

14 MS. YATES: First tab, I believe.

15 THE COURT: Yes.

16 THE WITNESS: This is the Denofrio.

17 MS. YATES: Yes.

18 THE WITNESS: Yes, okay. I have it.

19 BY MS. YATES:

20 Q. The scientific statement. Doctor, the results -- so
21 selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors, the use of SSRIs in
22 pregnancy has been investigated, I assume you agree with that?

23 A. Page number, please.

24 Q. I'm sorry.

25 A. That's okay. I just don't know where you are.

1 Q. Page 8.

2 A. Eight, thank you. Yes, okay.

3 Q. All right.

4 A. Now, I'm with you.

5 Q. SSRIs, the use of SSRIs in pregnancy has been
6 investigated. I assume you agree with that?

7 A. It has been investigated, yes.

8 Q. Okay. Results indicate that there is no increased risk
9 of CHD associated with the use of most SSRIs although
10 Paroxetine may be an exception, did I read that correctly?

11 A. You did.

12 Q. And I take it you disagree with that?

13 A. Well, it's not specific about Zoloft, I mean my opinion
14 is absolutely clear about Zoloft, they don't mention it and I
15 assume that you would put that in the category of the new
16 increased risk and then I would disagree with it.

17 Q. Okay. Right. And so most --

18 A. But not the Paxil.

19 Q. Right. They say no increased risk. Most SSRIs and
20 then they actually separate out Paxil may be an exception;
21 right?

22 A. Well, I don't know if they think of any others as being
23 an exception, I don't know.

24 Q. They certainly don't state it; right?

25 A. No. They don't say all but one, they just say most.

1 Q. And then the only one they site to is Paroxetine which
2 is Paxil?

3 A. That is correct.

4 Q. Okay. Doctor, another article on your reliance list is
5 by Dr. Refuse et al.

6 A. Could you say that name again?

7 Q. I'm saying it the way I said it, but I've heard her say
8 it and it's nothing like this, but it's Refuse?

9 A. Refuse, yes.

10 Q. Refuse. Good.

11 A. And that's in your binder too, right.

12 THE COURT: Same book.

13 BY MS. YATES:

14 Q. Yes. Thank you.

15 A. Okay. Yes, I have it, I see it at least.

16 Q. And this is -- let me know when you get there.

17 A. Yes, I have the paper open and now in front of me.

18 Q. Perfect, and it's specific SSRIs and birth defects:
19 Basion Analysis to Interpret New Data in the Context of
20 Previous Reports. That's a title; right?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. And it was published very recently accepted for
23 publication May 29, 2015?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And if we turn to page 2015, I'm sorry, page 4.

1 Doctor, it shows that Zoloft was the most commonly SSRI when
2 the study was done; is that right?

3 A. In this population, that is correct. This is a U.S.
4 population.

5 Q. In fact, the study was funded by the Centers For
6 Disease Control and Prevention; right, the CDC?

7 A. I'm not familiar with the funders of the study it
8 probably says somewhere, but --

9 Q. Right. Let's go to page 8.

10 A. Oh, there we go.

11 Q. Okay.

12 A. The data collection was funded, yes.

13 Q. Right.

14 A. I don't know if that refers to just the MBDPS whether
15 that's funded by the CDC or whether they funded the study. It
16 actually looks like it's just the data itself.

17 Q. The data collection?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. All right. Are you aware, sir, and you've reviewed the
20 study it's on your reliance list?

21 A. Is it on my reliance list?

22 Q. You did a supplemental reliance list dated August 13,
23 2015.

24 A. Okay. Well then it's, I know it's very recent that
25 I've seen it, so I was confused because you were referring me

1 back to the reliance list for my report and it couldn't -- I
2 didn't think it could be possibly be in there.

3 Q. Right. So this is a supplemental list, I'm sorry.

4 A. Okay. All right. So a different document. Okay.
5 That's fine.

6 Q. Okay.

7 A. I've certainly seen it, so --

8 Q. All right. And you are aware, sir, that in fact the
9 CDC has posted the key findings from this study on their
10 website; right?

11 A. No. I haven't actually looked at the CDC website in
12 the last week since I've seen this paper.

13 Q. All right. Well, let's see if you agree with some of
14 the postings on the CDC website based on the study that you've
15 reviewed; okay?

16 A. Sure.

17 Q. All right. Let's go to tab 232.

18 A. I can't read it.

19 Q. Wait a minute, we're getting there doctor, I'm sorry?

20 A. Okay. I can't even try on that one.

21 Q. No. I give up too as well, doctor, I apologize and I
22 need a page number, page two.

23 A. Is it in the binder?

24 Q. Well, that's a good point?

25 THE COURT: No.

1 BY MS. YATES:

2 Q. No. Sorry, can we struggle along and -- we've got it.
3 I'm sorry.

4 A. Yes, thank you.

5 Q. So, doctor, if you go to page 2 and it says, now I've
6 lost it. So the -- actually it's the bolded paragraph, New
7 CDC Study Findings.

8 A. I'm with -- oh, you've just changed it, but, oh, okay.
9 Yes, I see that paragraph.

10 Q. All right. And then let's pull out. Researchers
11 found -- what you have [indiscernible] there we go, thank you.
12 Researchers found that some birth defects occur about two or
13 three times more frequently among babies born to women who
14 took certain types of SSRI medications early in pregnancy.

15 This analysis -- wait a minute, I'm reading from
16 somewhere else.

17 A. No, you're reading what I'm reading.

18 Q. Am I right?

19 THE COURT: You're at the bottom of the page is
20 where the pullout is from, yes.

21 MS. YATES: I'm sorry, I'm saying what does this
22 study add?

23 THE COURT: What does this study add?

24 THE WITNESS: Okay. I can read that too.

25 BY MS. YATES:

1 Q. Right. Okay. What does this study add? Researchers
2 found some birth defects occur about two or three times more
3 frequently among babies born to women who took certain SSRI
4 medications like Fluoxetine and Paroxetine early in pregnancy.

5 However, links between birth defects and other SSIs
6 like Sertraline were not observed in the CDC study. Did I
7 read that correctly?

8 A. You read it correctly.

9 Q. And that study is the Refuse study that we just talked
10 about that's on your reliance list?

11 A. Yes. There's -- I looked -- this looks like an online
12 press release from CDC specifically about the Refuse study.

13 Q. Right. It's their website; right?

14 A. As I said an online press release, yes.

15 Q. Okay. And let's go to the next page if we can where it
16 says reassuringly. What page is it?

17 MR. CHEFFO: Three.

18 MS. YATES: Page 3, next page. Page three.

19 BY MS. YATES:

20 Q. Reassuringly, doctor are you with me?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. What were the studies main findings as the heading,
23 right doctor? And then the -- fourth bullet, third bullet,
24 sorry. Reassuringly, researchers did not confirm links
25 between Sertraline, the SSRI used most often and any of the

1 birth defects observed in previous studies. Did I read that
2 correctly?

3 A. You did.

4 Q. And in fact Dr. Refuse reports the same thing in their
5 study if we turn to page 7 of her study.

6 A. I'm there.

7 Q. Okay. Tab 230, okay. Doctor, if we go to page 7 the
8 CDC website is actually referring to this language. It is
9 reassuring that none of the five previously reported
10 associations between Sertraline and birth defects were
11 confirmed in this analysis particularly since about 40 percent
12 of women reporting use of an SSRI in early pregnancy used
13 Sertraline. Did I read that correctly?

14 A. You did.

15 Q. And I take it that you disagree when the conclusions of
16 Dr. Refuse and the postings on the CDC website?

17 A. Well, she took this study in complete isolation and
18 ignored almost more than 90 percent of the rest of the
19 evidence we've been talking about, that's what this study
20 says. This is the one study on the National Birth Defects
21 Prevention Study where they collect the data like this. This
22 is an update as we discussed earlier of the Alwan study. The
23 Alwan study reported a lower association here and this study
24 actually increased it substantially because the new data
25 contradicted the Alwan study so I can't possibly -- knowing

1 that detailed analysis I can't possibly agree with this
2 sweeping generalization in the statement, it's not based on
3 the methodology I used which was to look at all the evidence.

4 Q. Okay. Thank you doctor.

5 MS. YATES: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Thank you. Redirect?

7 MR. ZONIES: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 BY MR. ZONIES:

9 Q. Dr. Jewell, in the National Birth Defects Prevention
10 Study do you -- that's a study -- how did they determine
11 exposure in that study? Do you know?

12 A. I do in the sense that I've read it, this one
13 relatively recently as was just discussed. They did this, if
14 my memory is and we could look at the paper, we just had it
15 opened, it's based on interviews with the mother at 11, you
16 know, on an average about 11 months post-delivery, so about an
17 average of a year and a half post the exposure period by
18 interview and it was a very, very simplistic question. The
19 question I think is actually in the paper if you're interested
20 in it.

21 Q. So, just to be clear then the two eleven months plus
22 nine months, 20 months?

23 A. A year and a half, I said to be conservative.

24 Q. Thank you. A year and a half after the question, the
25 exposure, the questions asking about, so a year and a half

1 later they interviewed a mother and said, hey, what drugs were
2 you taking a year and a half ago? Is that one of the -- is
3 that how this study gathered the evidence of use?

4 A. Yes. They didn't have the word "hey" in there, but
5 they said, to be specific on page 2, "Between three months
6 before conception and the babies' date of birth and putting in
7 the name of the baby, did you take any of the following
8 medications"?

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. Prozac, Paxil, Zoloft, Celexa that was the entire
11 question.

12 Q. And in your in depth analysis does that give you --
13 that you've expressed in your report, did that give you some
14 concern about the accurate capture of exposure in this study?

15 A. Yes. In a lot of work done on trying to measure
16 exposure in the accuracy of the classification of exposure
17 using various methods, maternal interviews probably the worst
18 of all for reasons that we could go into at length.

19 Retrospective maternal interview, so interviewing no
20 prospectively, that's bad enough, but retrospective maternal
21 interview is known to be extremely inaccurate, I mean, very
22 high rated of inaccuracies.

23 So most statisticians when they see that level of
24 inaccuracy know that the impact of that on the results is it
25 will wash out or dilute any potential association and that's

1 why we've moved to more accurate measures of exposure.

2 Q. And despite your concerns about that, you actually
3 expressly discussed those concerns in great detail in your
4 report.

5 A. I do and there are other studies that use maternal
6 interviews and that's why yesterday when I said not all of
7 these studies that were used in the meta-analysis or in my
8 visualization stand with equal footing, because they measure
9 exposure differently and that makes a big difference.

10 Q. And despite those concerns you didn't hide from those
11 studies, those results are all in here; correct?

12 A. Yes. I believe Refuse should have been added to this
13 somewhere. Yes, it's there.

14 Q. Yes.

15 A. So, it's there.

16 Q. Okay. And you take that into your analysis as you said
17 of the whole data and that's part of what you --

18 A. That's part of the methodology, but you have to look at
19 the issue of bias and how exposure is measured. We haven't
20 talked about it a great deal, but it's a very important part
21 of the puzzle.

22 Q. Now, Dr. Jewell on your cross-examination you were
23 asked about the conclusions of some of the study authors; do
24 you recall that?

25 A. I do.

1 Q. And one of them was the Bond Study in 2014?

2 A. Yes, in the U.K.

3 Q. And that was a depression restricted analysis, in other
4 words it had women who were depressed on both sides of the
5 equation?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. And you were showing this quote from the abstract at
8 the beginning of the paper; right?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And it says overall MCA risk and I think you pointed
11 out what does MCA mean?

12 A. Major congenital abnormality.

13 Q. So, MCA risk did not increase with maternal depression
14 or with antidepressant prescriptions and I think you also
15 discussed that that's talking about the all SSRIs; right?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. Is that relevant to your analysis, MCA risk with all
18 SSRIs?

19 A. No, because I want to be very specific about Zoloft and
20 not assume that there's a common effect for all of them. It's
21 relevant to the extent that the antidepressants that are
22 lumped together show no increase because for there to be no
23 confounding by indication they should be at increased risk,
24 because they're suffering from depression, but as I state in
25 my report many studies don't find that and we've talked a

1 little bit about that, the absence of that evidence.

2 Q. And then, Dr. Jewell you actually discussed this study
3 in great detail in your report; correct?

4 A. In some detail, yes.

5 Q. In some detail. And, but you actually -- next slide,
6 please -- discussed the actually -- not these results which
7 were just shown to you, you discussed these results that are
8 about Zoloft and about cardiac birth defects; right?

9 A. I did, yes.

10 Q. This wasn't shown to you during cross-examination was
11 it?

12 A. It was not. No.

13 Q. And you actually agree with these conclusions in Bond;
14 right?

15 A. I do.

16 Q. And Bond seems to agree with you.

17 A. Well, we'd have to ask Bond but that's -- I don't
18 disagree with this statement.

19 Q. And importantly, in Bond the result that they're
20 talking about here is a 1.39 or essentially a 40 percent
21 increase in risk that was nonsignificant in Bond; right?

22 A. That's correct. And I did bring that up to the
23 opposing counsel.

24 Q. And yet that's the result, nonsignificant that they're
25 saying is consistent with other results?

1 A. That is correct.

2 Q. Even though it's nonsignificant?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. So, to test consistency here Bond certainly like you
5 does not have a concern with methodologically looking at
6 nonsignificant results when you're looking at all of the data;
7 correct?

8 A. No, because if they had found an odds ratio of .79 they
9 might well have written the sentence saying even though that
10 wasn't statistically significant that contradicted earlier
11 studies. That would've been a different conclusion,
12 hypothetical, because that's not what happened, but I think
13 you should look at nonsignificant results and see how they
14 compare with what we already know in the literature.

15 Q. And what you just described is actually what Refuse
16 did; right? Which was a nonsignificant finding in Refuse and
17 they said this contradicts other significant findings?

18 A. Yes. They did, yes.

19 Q. Yes, okay. And to be clear methodologically everyone
20 seems to think it's appropriate to look at nonsignificant
21 results when assessing consistency, it's happening in the very
22 papers you've reviewed.

23 A. It's certainly part of the evidence; correct.

24 Q. And with regard to overlap, do you recall some
25 questions about overlap in a dangerous population?

1 A. I do.

2 Q. The next slide, please. You mentioned that you find
3 there was some independent scientific data and evidence even
4 in the -- even when populations overlap somewhat that informed
5 your opinion; is that right?

6 A. Yes. I spent some time on this yesterday that
7 particularly with the Jimenez-Solem I there's the least
8 overlap, it's the biggest difference from Petersen and Cornum
9 that the new data that's provided by Jimenez-Solem provides
10 new information beyond what was in either Petersen or Cornum
11 if to the extent that it's different that would of course
12 contradict or not confirm to the extent it's the same it is a
13 measure of independent replication that's most, I think
14 relevant in comparing Jimenez-Solem's result and I talked
15 about this yesterday so I don't know for the sake of time I
16 don't want to repeat it, but had the odds ratios been
17 dramatically lower in Jimenez-Solem for the new women, their
18 overall result would've been substantially lower than what
19 Petersen or Cornum reported. So that does provide some form
20 of replication.

21 Q. And I think we looked at yesterday with Refuse and
22 Alwan in that situation, not only you looked at the fact that
23 Refuse must have necessarily had a 20 to 30 percent increased
24 risk in the new women in that population but Professor Bracken
25 another epidemiologist supported that methodology for looking

1 for replication?

2 A. Exactly, yes.

3 Q. And Dr. Jewell, it wasn't just Professor Bracken who's
4 done that and you, in Cornum itself this is done.

5 A. Yes, Cornum itself made that point and he of course
6 knew about Petersen, they were probably -- knew each other
7 personally, I would imagine, both from Denmark looking --
8 interested in the same issues and they knew about the Petersen
9 paper which came first as we discussed this morning and they
10 point out that they were willing to compare the results that
11 they got with Petersen knowing that there was some overlap,
12 but not entire overlap because they realized they would've the
13 potential with the new women to change things a little bit and
14 so they believe that it agrees with Petersen, so that
15 reflecting -- confirms if you want Petersen. They wouldn't
16 have said that if they felt the data was just an entire
17 replication of the same data, because they knew it wasn't
18 quite.

19 Q. And the that that we're talking about Dr. Jewell is his
20 quote from the Cornum paper in 2010, "Our data are from the
21 same registers as those used by Petersen and colleagues,
22 however, the study by Petersen and colleague was based on
23 nationwide registries and included children born in Denmark
24 between 1996 and 2003 right after that discussed the fact that
25 there's a consistency there; correct?

1 A. Yes, and they were giving you those dates, because
2 earlier in the paper they've given the dates they looked at
3 and the counties that they looked at in Denmark which we've
4 discussed actually this morning.

5 Q. And Dr. Jewell, you were just asked about this label,
6 this proposed label and I want to quote from the label here.
7 It says, "An increased risk of congenital cardiac defects,
8 especially septal, the most common type of congenital heart
9 defects was observed in some published epidemiological studies
10 with first trimester Sertraline exposure." Is that wholly 110
11 percent consistent with your opinion?

12 A. Could you tell me the page number on that?

13 Q. I'm sorry, it's the label in the bottom right corner --
14 thank you, for this -- the bates number ends with 3746.

15 A. Okay. I'm there now. Sorry.

16 Q. You've got that and I'm sorry, it's in that first
17 paragraph at the top --

18 A. Yes, I see -- right to the top of the page.

19 Q. Yes. Just after the Miles data that's put in there and
20 it says, "An increased risk of congenital cardiac defects,
21 especially septal, the most common type of congenital heart
22 defects was observed in some published epidemiological studies
23 with first trimester Sertraline exposure." That is wholly
24 consistent with your opinion; is that correct?

25 A. That is correct. As I said to the other counsel, I

1 agree with that part of the sentence.

2 Q. And is it your appreciation having been across from Dr.
3 Kimmel about the number of time said so far that he disagrees
4 with that statement?

5 A. Well, I think you should ask Dr. Kimmel that question.

6 Q. Okay. And then they go onto talk about the confounding
7 by the indication and underlying depression; correct?

8 A. And I commented on that that I think is an insufficient
9 description of what actually happened.

10 Q. But that is something that you specifically in your
11 report and ad nauseam over the past few days have discussed in
12 great detail.

13 A. As I've said, my methodology demands a consideration of
14 all kinds of bias, one which is confounding by indication.

15 Q. So methodologically those two, that one sentence is
16 effectively consistent with the method you applied it's simply
17 here. There's some concern about confounding by the
18 underlying depression which you also share, so
19 methodologically you went after that and it's unclear whether
20 or not this even disagrees with your ultimate conclusion about
21 that issue.

22 A. That is correct. I of course don't know the background
23 analysis as was discussed that has been carried out by whoever
24 proposed this language. It's clearly very briefly described
25 their attention to confounding by indication, I would find it

1 hard to imagine that they methodologically did as advanced a
2 look at the question as I did.

3 Q. But again, we don't know that?

4 A. But I don't know that. I don't, because I don't see --

5 Q. Dr. Jewell during your cross one of the issues that was
6 brought up was the potential error in one of the slides.

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. In the upper bound of a confidence interval; do you
9 recall that?

10 A. I do. Just before lunch.

11 Q. And have you -- did you examine that issue?

12 A. I did.

13 Q. And what was your conclusion?

14 A. The -- I actually need to see the one.

15 MR. ZONIES: May I approach, Your Honor?

16 THE COURT: Yes, you may.

17 THE WITNESS: Yes. Which slide because it was
18 the other counsel who had these slides. Yes, okay. I've seen
19 it now. This slide here which was the pie chart and is
20 labeled Huybrechts-Jewell analysis has the correct odds ratio
21 and the correct -- there it is that is correct. The upper
22 bound is 3.3. Later on in the slides that with were used
23 yesterday, that result was quoted again with an incorrect
24 upper bound of the confidence and everything else was correct.
25 BY MR. ZONIES:

1 Q. Yes, and here's the same slide with -- in other words
2 you've corrected it now with the 3.3. Is this the slide from
3 yesterday?

4 A. Yes. That -- no, it's later on in these slides. That
5 was already -- it's later on that was the second slide that
6 counsel showed me. Yes, it's that slide that she's hold that
7 where it's -- I think it says 1.9 where the, well, let's wait.

8 Q. Yes. This says 1.9, 1.1 to 3.3.

9 A. Well, that's the same, so --

10 Q. Right.

11 A. There was one that counsel showed me this morning that
12 said 2. --

13 Q. That was this one that says 2. --

14 A. Oh, so it's been corrected now already? Yes, so this
15 is the corrected version. Yes. So the 2.39 was transcription
16 error of some form, so I gave away a little bit of my evidence
17 inadvertently, by whoever transcribed the slide. So the
18 correct confidence intervals is 1.1 to 3.3.

19 Q. And so would you prefer that this replace in deck?

20 A. Yes. This is the corrected version and that should be
21 replaced.

22 MR. ZONIES: Your Honor, I don't know what we're
23 going to do about this and I haven't discussed it with
24 counsel, but we would ultimately would move for admission for
25 record purposes at a minimum that the notebook that has the

1 studies in it and Dr. Jewell's report in it and the slide
2 decks will provide the Court with colored version for the
3 record as well.

4 THE COURT: All right. Is there any objection
5 to any of the submissions by the PSE?

6 MS. YATES: No, objections, Your Honor. And we
7 will provide the Court the same to the extent if you haven't
8 already received it.

9 THE COURT: All right. Any objections to any of
10 the defense exhibits?

11 MR. ZONIES: No, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: All right.

13 MR. ZONIES: I mean, yes, to the exhibits,
14 but --

15 THE COURT: They're all admitted anyway.

16 BY MR. ZONIES:

17 Q. One final line of questioning Dr. Jewell. Now, I'm not
18 sure what the objection is, but there maybe some floating
19 objection about your qualifications to reach the causal
20 conclusion in this case. So, I'd like to explore those
21 qualifications. Have you, Dr. Jewell, reached causal
22 conclusions in other cases and/or in others settings?

23 A. Absolutely.

24 Q. Have you challenged on your qualifications and ability
25 to do so and passed whatever that challenge was whether it was

1 Daubert or Frye or otherwise?

2 A. I certainly have survived those challenges whether it
3 was about causation and I don't know, but I certainly survived
4 them.

5 Q. And in some of those, Dr. Jewell, well, all of them,
6 they were in areas about which you have limited exposure, for
7 example in this very courtroom you testified about myocardial
8 infarction; correct?

9 A. I did.

10 Q. And are you a cardiologist?

11 A. No.

12 Q. And in that case as well you've had to deal with the
13 concept of myocardial ischemia as compared to myocardial
14 infarction; do you remember that?

15 A. I did.

16 Q. And are you schooled enough to be able to give us a
17 lecture on those issues?

18 A. No. I could only give you a lecture on how once the
19 data has been -- the terms have been defined and applied to
20 data how the data should be analyzed.

21 Q. And even in that case in Avandia in particular, if you
22 recall myocardial ischemia was defined by the manufacturer and
23 that was what was used; do you recall that?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. Right. You didn't make an independent cutting of the

1 data or do anything, you accepted those classifications by the
2 experts?

3 A. I do, yes.

4 Q. Is that the same thing you kid here?

5 A. Absolutely the same.

6 Q. Have you published Dr. Jewell on causation and
7 causation issues?

8 A. I have, yes, from a statistical perspective.

9 Q. And you mentioned a new book that you have coming out.
10 What is the focus of that book?

11 A. Causation.

12 Q. What's the name of that book?

13 A. Causal Inference in Statistics a Primer.

14 Q. And have you published on the --

15 A. It's co-authored I should say. It's co-authored with
16 Judea Pearl who's undoubtedly one of the world's leading
17 experts on causation.

18 Q. And Dr. Jewell have you published on pregnancy before
19 or are you in the future?

20 A. I have published papers before when I've been a
21 statistician that have looked at pregnancy outcomes and the
22 effect of chemical exposures, usually associated with
23 pesticide exposure and pregnant women in California. And so
24 are in the record in my CV and I currently have two papers in
25 various stages of review on rheumatoid arthritis and during

1 pregnancy which actually uses the GEE model.

2 Q. Which you have also published on?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Oh, and speaking of that, there was a list of studies
5 that were depression restricted studies that counsel discussed
6 with you; do you recall that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And that those somehow provide better evidence with
9 which, I think you would agree?

10 A. I think it's very helpful as a first step to
11 confounding my indication to do that.

12 Q. And counsel discussed with you Huybrechts, Bond, and
13 Jimenez-Solem with their attempt to get at that too, did you
14 recall that?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Counsel I don't think discussed with you Berard and the
17 fact that that study is also depression restricted?

18 A. That is correct. The most recent -- her the, only one
19 that I have, yes.

20 Q. That has that higher look at a smaller class trying to
21 get rid of confounding; right?

22 A. By indication, yes.

23 Q. Right. Thank you, Dr. Jewell?

24 A. Thank you.

25 THE COURT: Any recross?

1 MS. YATES: Thank you. Two questions, Your
2 Honor.

3 BY MS. YATES:

4 Q. Doctor, with regard to the Refuse study you seem to be
5 critical of the fact that they used interviews in order to
6 gather their data; right?

7 A. I'm not critical, that may have been the only data they
8 had, but it's known to be less reliable as a measure of true
9 exposure.

10 Q. And what method did the Cornum study use in obtaining
11 their information?

12 A. I can't recall without going back to the papers. I
13 know some of them by heart, but not that one to be explicit.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. The registries in Denmark, certainly Jimenez-Solem used
16 pharmacy records [indiscernible].

17 Q. I misspoke.

18 A. Oh, so you're not asking about Cornum?

19 Q. No.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. Do you know what method Luick used?

22 A. Yes. Luick used I believe my memory is she used and
23 her team used maternal interviews.

24 Q. Nothing further, thank you.

25 MR. ZONIES: Nothing further.

1 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You may step
2 down.

3 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

4 THE COURT: And we will adjourn for today and
5 let's discuss the plan for tomorrow. Any other witnesses from
6 the plaintiff.

7 MR. ZONIES: None, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Any other witnesses from the
9 defendant?

10 MR. CHEFFO: No, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Then if the evidence is closed
12 because we've admitted all of the charts and the documents and
13 the binders and the additional documents then would you like
14 to argue in the morning.

15 MR. CHEFFO: I think we would. We can do it
16 relatively briefly and succinctly, but as Your Honor knows
17 there's a lot of information the binders and things so
18 obviously it's all for the Court and Your Honor's convenience
19 and assistance, but we think it would be helpful to do within
20 an hour or less of closing as we've done in the past and then
21 to the extent after that if Your Honor would like any kind of
22 post-hearing briefing, of course we would entertain that
23 follow Your Honor's guidance on that.

24 THE COURT: I do not require post-hearing
25 briefing, but I never like to deprive good counsel of their

1 last shot. Tomorrow one hour or less for each of you.

2 MR. CHEFFO: Okay.

3 THE COURT: We'll start at 10:00 and I would
4 appreciate if we could really start on time and then get that
5 done. And I always find that that's helpful. The
6 openings were helpful and the closing I trust will be just as
7 helpful.

8 I'm not as impressed that briefing -- additional
9 briefing is necessary, but I need to know how you both feel
10 about that, Mr. Zonies?

11 MR. ZONIES: I don't, I wouldn't be impressed by
12 my own brief either, so I think the Court has --

13 THE COURT: It's not personal, it's a
14 blanket statement.

15 MR. ZONIES: I think the Court has a fine handle
16 on the situation and I'm not [indiscernible] I might get a
17 shot from somebody in the back.

18 THE COURT: You might.

19 UNKNOWN: I agree.

20 THE COURT: As he runs out of the courtroom.

21 MR. ZONIES: I don't think it, I certainly don't
22 think it is necessary.

23 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Cheffo?

24 MR. CHEFFO: Again, I don't want to be one to
25 force a brief on Your Honor, if you have a lot of paper --

1 THE COURT: Well, it's not that. The briefing
2 was very, very complete in this matter.

3 MR. CHEFFO: Here's what I would say and then
4 maybe we can talk to PSE on this. Again, I don't think we
5 want to take a lot of time or a lot of pages and I'm not even
6 sure we'll need it, so, may be I can call Chris with my folks
7 and obviously we'll only do it if I think we can do something
8 within a limited page limit that we think add to the story.
9 If it doesn't then you don't need anymore and we don't need
10 anymore.

11 THE COURT: Based on something that was
12 surprising or came out that you don't feel each of you that
13 you dealt enough with in the other briefs, I'll give you a
14 chance to do that if you really need it.

15 As I said, I'm not going to preclude, but think
16 about that overnight; all right?

17 MR. CHEFFO: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.

18 MR. ZONIES: And if I may clarify one thing,
19 Your Honor, I understand that the evidence is technically
20 closed and I happen to talk to Mr. Cheffo about this and I'm
21 sure he'll let me know if this is a problem. Because we
22 anticipated Dr. Kimmel was going to testify and because he is
23 not testifying I've discussed with counsel that we would be
24 permitted to use his prior testimony either through deposition
25 or at the Frye hearing or elsewhere in our closing essentially

1 and argue that. And to the extent that that's not formally in
2 evidence before the Court, when we argue that I would either,
3 whatever counsel wants to do, move that in as additional
4 evidence, it will be in the closing slides which we'll present
5 to the Court as well.

6 THE COURT: Is that testimony at deposition or
7 is it trial or is it Frye hearing?

8 MR. ZONIES: It is -- I'd have to see which ones
9 I need to use, but I think it's Frye hearing.

10 THE COURT: All right.

11 MR. ZONIES: That was sort of the condition that
12 which we didn't need call on.

13 MR. CHEFFO: This is what I would say, as a
14 general matter that they obviously we didn't object to, I'm
15 certain of the things they've -- I think they've referred to
16 it in their brief. It's hard for me to say kind of blanket
17 without seeing it we agree, but I think the rule of reason
18 will apply and to the extent it's sworn testimony and we did
19 say that to make things move a little quicker and not have to
20 call Dr. Kimmel that we would understand that they'd be
21 relying on certain prior testimony.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 MR. CHEFFO: So, I guess generally yes, but
24 we'll just want to reserve our rights depending on what he
25 does.

1 THE COURT: Any record testimony could be relied
2 on and it's not unfair surprise to anybody but me and it's not
3 unfair, so I'll have a chance to read a transcript to bolster
4 my understanding of whatever you're arguing about. So, that's
5 fine with me.

6 MR. ZONIES: Thank you.

7 THE COURT: Work on that tonight. And is there
8 anything else? Thank you very much.

9 MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Thank you, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: We're adjourned.

11 - - -

12 (Whereupon, the proceeding was concluded
13 at 5:10 p.m.)

14 - - -

C E R T I F I C A T E

I do hereby certify that the aforesaid hearing was transcribed by me from an audio recording to the best of my ability; and that I am neither of counsel nor kin to any party in said action, nor interested in the outcome thereof.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this ____ day of ____, 2015.



Janine Thomas
Notary Public

A				
AAHA 90:5	77:21 115:13	89:18 90:22 91:6	and/or 110:22	appropriate 18:11
ability 110:24	116:8 118:3	94:13 98:1 102:13	Anesthesia 88:18	63:12 72:20 73:12
120:5	address 71:18 77:9	102:16 107:1	annihilate 51:22	74:22,23 85:22
able 33:8 53:13	addressed 51:11	113:9 116:19	anomalies 44:25	103:20
69:20 79:10	adequacy 78:12	118:17	45:6 60:1	approved 75:21
111:16	adequate 65:13	agreed 19:25 73:3	anomaly 44:20	April 54:4,4,11
abnormality 50:24	adjourn 115:4	agreeing 18:24	50:25 59:13	77:11
101:12	adjourned 119:10	agreement 79:8	answer 6:10,12	area 71:10
Abramson 63:6	adjust 14:13 33:4,8	84:21	8:18 10:25 35:1	areas 111:6
absence 102:1	34:24 42:12 52:19	agrees 105:14	answers 15:11	argue 69:8 115:14
absent 69:20	88:4	AHA 69:12 70:1	anticipated 117:22	118:1,2
absolute 19:16	adjusted 16:1	ahead 47:6 49:18	antidepressant	argues 19:16
absolutely 33:2	28:20 34:14,14	al 88:11 92:5	19:18 44:24	arguing 119:4
43:13 51:8 65:4	35:17,21,25 47:17	Albeit 28:5	101:14	argument 31:16
72:8 74:23 76:15	51:17 52:21 54:1	alert 64:19	antidepressants	51:2 71:6
91:14 110:23	59:25	allegedly 78:18	19:10 42:8 101:21	arguments 86:2
112:5	adjusting 14:2	allow 69:12 87:23	anybody 119:2	arm 10:17
abstract 44:14 57:3	53:12,19	allowed 11:7 78:15	anymore 40:14	arose 39:24
57:12,13,21,22	adjustment 33:4	alluded 53:10	77:23 117:9,10	ARPS 1:14
58:2 101:7	34:1 35:1,20	alphabetical 82:5	anyway 81:20	arteries 30:14
abstracts 57:13,14	46:14 47:18 48:1	Alwan 24:21,21,23	110:15	arthritis 112:25
accept 45:7 87:6	48:3 52:23	25:20,21,22 26:2	apologize 3:8 16:8	article 12:13 62:22
acceptance 73:8	adjustments 33:23	26:3 27:4,25 28:2	30:1 90:4 94:21	63:2,18,24 64:9
accepted 21:23	34:17 52:7	28:4,9,12 29:2,11	apparent 61:6	64:11,14 65:25
73:15 78:7 92:22	admissible 78:22	34:1,19 61:20	apparently 30:2	92:4
112:1	admission 109:24	97:22,23,25	37:8 68:8	asked 7:9 13:2,5,15
account 42:7 50:23	admitted 110:15	104:22	appear 28:9 75:10	73:24 78:2 82:11
64:16 66:1 76:13	115:12	American 58:20	APPEARANCES	82:16,20,25 83:2
accounted 76:25	Adults 88:15	61:20 88:14,20	1:8	88:24 100:23
accumulated 19:15	advanced 108:1	amount 6:23 73:25	appendix 39:21	106:5
19:15	adverse 10:19	75:23	apple 6:16,17 7:20	asking 13:4 72:12
accumulating 6:9	advice 70:25 71:1	analogy 10:15	7:24 8:4	98:25 114:18
accuracy 99:16	advised 4:6	analysis 11:6,19	apples 7:5,10,15,16	assess 18:12
accurate 74:16	affirmation 80:8	12:3,8,18 14:2,12	8:5,6 9:20 10:14	assessing 103:21
99:14 100:1	aforesaid 120:3	18:22 19:22,23,24	10:16	assistance 115:19
accused 62:13	afternoon 81:10,11	19:25 20:1 34:11	apple's 7:21	associated 14:18
64:25	age 49:1	46:13,22 47:3,8	applied 10:17	19:17 26:7 40:5
action 120:6	agency 80:14	47:13 48:15,16	68:15 71:11 72:18	44:24 50:4 52:8
actual 42:20	agent 50:1	57:8 59:17 73:14	107:16 111:19	64:18 87:25 91:9
ad 107:11	ago 7:13 77:16 99:2	74:24 75:25 76:16	apply 44:12 69:1	112:22
add 20:2 95:22,23	agree 4:6,9 5:5	92:19 95:15 97:11	118:18	association 21:8
96:1 117:8	21:22 39:5 40:17	98:1 99:12 100:16	appreciate 15:12	22:7 31:3,20
added 100:12	42:10 43:25 51:5	101:3,17 107:23	55:24 116:4	37:14 40:9 44:11
addition 29:10	52:20 61:9,24	108:20	appreciation 107:2	50:12,21 51:3
additional 57:19	62:3 68:8,9 77:4	analyzed 111:20	approach 3:5 13:5	52:24 53:2 88:15
	78:19 79:1 83:21	analyzing 37:7,12	44:6 57:9 108:15	88:21 97:23 99:25
	84:24 85:17 88:3	72:13	approaching 13:3	associations 21:5

25:13 30:10 38:5 97:10 assume 13:23 26:13 34:25 35:13,15 53:2 83:4 90:22 91:6,15 101:20 assumed 14:5 attached 81:23 attempt 41:1,6,16 51:17 113:13 attempted 41:17 attempts 42:12 attention 5:10 65:19 107:25 attenuated 78:19 78:20 attribute 87:1 audio 1:16 120:4 August 74:7 77:12 78:4 93:22 Australian 58:20 author 13:4,5 37:7 63:6 authorities 78:18 authors 19:9 26:2 26:22 27:16 32:16 37:12,18 39:5 47:18 49:9 59:16 71:23 72:4 100:23 author's 25:23 available 84:11 85:23 Avandia 3:2,8,9,18 4:7 7:9 8:15 9:2,6 22:16,21 23:24 71:15 111:21 average 6:16,20 8:21 98:16,17 averaging 4:10,18 5:2,7 6:15,19,22 6:23 8:10,12,24 86:9 averse 69:15 aware 11:3 66:10 71:5 77:22 93:19 94:8 awfully 27:20	B babies 95:13 96:3 99:6 baby 99:7 back 4:6 9:2 13:15 18:11 29:8,9,25 30:23 31:16 33:7 33:9,25 43:2 48:2 50:18 54:2 55:5 57:22 64:7 65:4 74:11,11,21 75:4 75:7 76:9 82:4,23 89:5 94:1 114:12 116:17 backed 63:24 background 84:14 107:22 bad 99:20 Ban 42:14,17,24 43:25 44:13 46:12 50:9 based 4:20 5:5 17:13 19:1 30:23 31:5 45:4 52:23 53:1,4 57:2 66:7 68:20 69:19 70:9 79:6 94:14 98:2 98:15 105:22 117:11 bases 54:21 basically 74:21 76:9,13 77:15 78:1,4 Basion 92:19 basis 74:12 bates 84:2 106:14 battle 70:16 bear 6:11 64:13 beginning 55:1 74:3 101:8 belabor 4:5 belief 10:11 believe 9:4 12:3,3 13:2 16:13 20:15 20:17 22:22 23:5 32:8 33:14 34:1	34:13,16 35:23 69:21,22 72:12 75:13 79:23 83:10 85:22 88:5 90:14 100:12 105:14 114:22 bench 23:5 Berard 56:11,12 60:9,11,18 72:21 113:16 Berard's 56:25 58:4,6 Berkeley 62:12 best 48:9 51:20,25 120:5 better 14:21 17:6 64:23 71:9 79:15 113:8 beyond 104:10 bias 42:12,12 100:19 107:14 big 4:15 17:15 47:25 52:9,20 65:11 78:16 100:9 bigger 38:22 44:20 biggest 104:8 binder 19:3 20:14 20:16,17 49:20 67:5 82:2 90:9,10 90:13 92:11 94:23 binders 115:13,17 biostatistics 21:23 birth 26:9 28:17 31:21,23,25 44:8 51:4 53:1 59:15 76:7 78:8 84:13 84:14,16,19,23,25 85:23 86:5 89:25 92:18 95:12 96:2 96:5 97:1,10,20 98:9 99:6 102:8 bit 4:22 6:11 9:17 12:20,22 15:12 20:5 21:14 23:13 23:13 24:6 40:17 43:19 52:4 53:24 88:14 102:1	105:13 109:16 black 16:5 blanket 40:2 116:14 118:16 blown 55:12,15 blowups 55:22 blue 23:13 body 3:19 bolded 95:6 bolster 119:3 Bond 101:1 102:13 102:16,17,19,21 103:4 113:12 book 92:12 112:9 112:10,12 born 95:13 96:3 105:23 bottom 36:12 39:4 49:17 64:7 84:6 85:3 95:19 106:13 bound 17:11 108:8 108:22,24 bounds 18:2 Bracken 104:24 105:3 Bradford 36:9 break 18:7,8,11 33:24 breakout 32:3 brief 80:23 81:5 116:12,25 118:16 briefed 76:22 briefing 115:22,25 116:8,9 117:1 briefly 107:24 115:16 briefs 117:13 Brigham 45:18 bring 13:22 19:4 57:15 58:1 60:5 69:12 102:22 bringing 65:19 British 62:23 63:2 brought 108:6 bucket 29:15 bullet 96:23,23 busy 13:24 14:13	14:15 C C 76:4 120:1,1 CA 50:24 calculation 11:13 11:19,22 12:11,15 32:11 California 112:23 call 117:6 118:12 118:20 called 6:1 64:23 78:13 Canadian 58:20 candidate 6:24 capable 6:7 capture 99:14 cardiac 19:12 26:18,21,25 27:5 28:17 31:2 38:2 38:13,22 40:4 44:8,10,20 45:6 47:11 53:1,22 58:18 59:3,3,15 59:18 61:14,15 84:22,25 85:14,23 86:1,5 87:15,18 88:20 89:22 102:8 106:7,20 cardiologist 111:10 Cardiology 88:17 cardiovascular 36:15 63:3 88:16 88:17,18 careful 5:1 carried 107:23 case 4:23 6:1,22 9:2 13:11 26:18 31:5 32:6,7,8,9 33:15 62:6,14,16 64:2,8 64:25 66:7 68:11 68:21 69:24 71:13 79:4 80:12 110:20 111:12,21 cased 32:10 cases 30:23 31:10 110:22
---	---	---	---	---

categories 26:8	71:14 76:23	91:14 98:21	41:21 107:8	concerns 48:22
category 60:14	changing 75:25	103:19	comments 64:5	63:19 86:15 89:24
76:4 91:15	76:3	clearly 5:18 34:18	Committee 1:9	100:2,3,10
causal 10:11 50:21	characteristics	107:24	88:16	conclude 19:9 26:2
110:19,21 112:13	42:8	CLERK 81:8	common 50:2	26:6 49:9 68:22
causation 10:9 31:1	chart 16:7 34:9,17	clinical 3:20,24 4:1	87:19 101:20	concluded 37:1
31:12 111:3 112:6	41:12 58:9 60:23	9:23 40:20,24	106:8,21	119:12
112:7,11,17	108:19	65:10 88:17	commonly 19:17	concluding 27:17
Cause 47:2	charts 16:5 115:12	close 3:25	93:1	conclusion 19:1,10
causes 30:19 31:6	CHD 50:13,23 59:6	closed 115:11	communications	25:23 26:12,14,22
76:7 78:8	59:11,14 91:9	117:20	17:14	27:25 28:5 31:12
caveat 66:2	Cheffo 1:14 66:14	closing 115:20	community 70:22	32:17,23 37:18
caveats 61:25 62:4	66:19 67:1 71:18	116:6 117:25	COMPANY 1:20	38:25 39:1,3
64:15 65:25	72:2,3,8,24 73:3,6	118:4	comparative 84:14	44:13,19 55:2,2
CDC 93:6,15 94:9	76:2,20 77:5,8	cohort 47:4,9	compare 28:9	68:4 69:1,4,18
94:11,14 95:7	96:17 115:10,15	collaborate 13:4	57:12 67:14 69:14	70:3,4 71:10
96:6,12 97:8,16	116:2,23,24 117:3	colleague 75:3	103:14 105:10	78:21,24 87:10
Celexa 99:10	117:17,20 118:13	105:22	compared 84:13	89:19,19,20
Centers 93:5	118:23	colleagues 105:21	111:13	103:11 107:20
certain 23:12 64:18	Cheffo's 75:3 85:19	collect 97:21	comparing 11:8,9	108:13 110:20
66:11 68:20 73:19	chemical 112:22	collected 10:7	11:14 27:9 41:14	conclusions 19:21
75:23 83:20 89:25	child 31:25 32:1	collection 93:12,17	41:18 42:7,24	19:22 44:14 67:10
95:14 96:3 118:15	children 32:12	Collen 61:21,21	43:15 46:23	67:12 68:13,20
118:21	105:23	colored 110:2	104:14	69:8,18 70:9
certainly 3:17,18	Chris 117:6	colors 61:6	comparison 23:16	79:16 80:6 97:15
4:4 6:13 11:25	circle 56:19,21	column 19:7 50:20	29:19 41:14 44:2	100:23 102:13
44:2 45:25 56:12	circuit 90:4	Colvin 29:12 33:3	44:13 45:1 46:18	110:22
63:20 64:11 66:6	citations 36:21	34:12,16,17,23	46:20 49:10 87:22	conclusively 63:24
73:10,16 91:24	cite 24:17,21 29:10	35:17 36:1 48:2,7	comparisons 45:2	condition 40:20,24
94:7 103:4,23	29:11 30:8 44:7	59:25	compatible 50:1,2	118:11
111:2,3 114:15	50:7	Colwin 52:19	competing 62:24	conducted 9:21
116:21	City 65:14	combine 8:7	compile 55:7	10:24 36:25
certify 120:3	claim 30:18	combined 11:11	complete 55:16	confidence 16:10
challenge 110:25	claimed 64:1	combining 8:16	97:17 117:2	28:20 31:14 32:20
challenged 110:24	claiming 65:15	9:23	completely 36:3	47:10 60:16 85:13
challenges 111:2	claims 40:8 68:12	come 5:15 18:11	61:19	85:15 108:8,24
chance 15:14 17:8	clarify 70:6,7,19	29:25 31:12,18	compounding 16:1	109:18
45:1 117:14 119:3	86:14 117:18	50:18 64:22 74:21	computation 53:10	confidences 16:21
change 8:5 47:12	class 113:20	75:15 76:9 79:12	concept 111:13	confined 79:19
48:10 53:3,7,25	classic 70:16	comes 15:6 30:23	conception 12:7	confirm 39:2 43:14
57:24 60:4,15,22	classification 99:16	65:20	99:6	43:19,22 96:24
75:20 76:11 77:3	classifications	coming 8:13 15:8	concern 40:18,19	104:12
77:3 78:5,9 79:18	112:1	29:6 65:6 66:4	42:1,2 79:22	confirmed 97:11
105:13	clear 5:12,22 17:13	112:9	86:24 87:5 99:14	confirming 74:9
changed 47:21	27:11 29:5,9,14	comment 48:11	103:5 107:17	confirms 105:15
52:22 95:8	37:25 65:7 76:2	70:10 80:10 85:1	concerned 51:10	conflicting 41:22
changes 48:13	86:20,21 87:3	commented 16:17	76:24	confound 40:16

confounder 51:24 52:24	23:23 24:5,5,10 24:14 30:20 52:9	80:10,14 82:1,8,9 89:4 92:3,21 93:3	course 9:21 17:17 32:13 40:6 47:13	critical 89:2 114:5 114:7
confounders 52:3 87:23	75:17 79:12 92:19	100:11 101:6,16 102:3,22 103:1,3	50:17 61:12 62:21 68:1 81:13 84:24	criticisms 11:4 68:19
confounding 14:5 14:14 33:5,8	continue 50:17 87:9	103:7,23 105:25 106:24,25 107:7	104:11 105:5 107:22 115:22	criticizing 80:14 critique 70:10
34:24 35:2,6,17 37:19 40:17 41:1	continued 11:9	107:22 108:20,21 108:21,24 109:18	court 1:1,20 3:6 4:7 7:14 11:11 18:7,9	cross 2:3 6:23 108:5
41:16,18 45:5,16 48:1,12,19,20,22	contradict 104:12	111:8,24 113:18	18:15,18 20:13,22 25:6 29:23 49:21	cross-examination 100:22 102:10
49:11 50:3,13,18 51:2,6,12,13,21	contradicted 97:25 103:10	corrected 64:10 65:1,8 109:2,14	55:11,18,21,25 56:4 67:5,22,25	cross-examine 69:13,20
51:22,24 52:6,9 52:13,19,22,23	contradictory 38:7	109:15,20	68:7,14,25 69:5,9 69:16 70:6,15	CSR 1:16
53:12,20,20 54:1 88:4,8 101:23	contradicts 103:17	correction 64:14 65:12	71:4,6 72:2,4,23 72:25 73:4 74:25	current 55:11 70:20 83:5,5,20
107:6,14,17,25 113:11,21	contrast 71:2	correctly 7:1,2 8:20 11:1 19:12,13,18	75:15,19 76:13,19 77:7 78:11 79:7	currently 79:20 112:24
confused 93:25	control 14:21 42:12 42:24 43:15 87:23	23:18,19 26:9 28:21 34:21 36:18	80:12 81:1,3,5,8 81:10,12,15 83:12	cutting 111:25
congenital 26:8 28:4 42:6 44:20	controlled 3:11 64:22 65:9,21	36:19 37:14,21 39:16,17,19 45:2	83:15 87:6,8,12 89:12 90:10,12,15	CV 112:24
50:24,25 53:1 60:1 87:18,19	convenience 115:18	47:22 50:5,6,14 88:21 91:10 96:7	92:12 94:25 95:19 95:23 98:6 108:16	Cynthia 1:6 81:9
60:1 87:18,19 88:15 101:12	copies 83:16,17,17	96:8 97:2,13	110:2,4,7,9,12,15 113:25 115:1,4,8	<hr/> D <hr/>
106:7,8,20,21	core 29:17 32:5	correctness 78:12	115:11,18,24 116:3,12,13,15,18	D 2:1 63:6
conotruncal 24:23 26:20 30:12	corner 61:8 106:13	corrects 16:1	116:20,23 117:1 117:11 118:2,5,6	daily 80:15
conscious 31:24	Cornum 34:19 51:10 58:14,14	correspondence 67:16,17,20 75:4	118:10,22 119:1,7 119:10	dangerous 103:25
consequences 41:24	59:4 104:8,10,19	corresponding 55:9	courtroom 47:24 71:3,4 72:10	Danish 58:13,16,17 58:24 59:5 61:19
conservative 62:8 98:23	105:4,5,20 114:10 114:18	corresponds 28:4	81:13 111:7 116:20	dark 17:8
consider 73:13 74:23	CORR 1:12	Council 88:16,17 88:17,18	cover 80:25	data 6:9,13 10:19 11:14,21 12:10,14
consideration 107:13	correct 4:1,19,24 6:10 11:24 12:18	counsel 1:10,14 15:13 74:6,10	covers 86:10	13:3,7,7,25 14:1 14:12,15,24 16:8
consistency 103:4 103:21 105:25	13:16 15:20,21 16:18 17:7,20	77:10,12 80:6,17 81:13 102:23	co-author 13:15 14:12	17:25 18:1 22:3 23:7 35:14 38:16
consistent 42:1 45:12 78:8 102:25	22:3 24:24 26:12 27:15,19,22,23	106:25 108:18 109:6,11,24 113:5	co-authored 112:15,15	39:5 40:11 41:22 46:17 48:4 62:1,4
106:11,24 107:16	30:11,15,16,19 31:4 33:1 36:22	113:12,16 115:25 117:23 118:3	co-authors 63:5	63:19 72:14 84:20 85:23 88:6 92:19
contact 13:10	36:23 37:25 38:3 38:24 41:2,3,20	120:5	Co-Lead 1:9	93:12,16,17 97:21 97:24 100:17
contained 31:2 35:25 86:4	42:5,9 44:11 45:7 47:11,12 50:10	counted 60:25	created 18:23	103:6 104:3,9 105:16,17,20
contains 61:13,17	51:16 54:21 55:7 56:10 57:1,8	counter 45:5	criteria 6:9 10:3 36:9 52:15	106:19 111:19,20 111:20 112:1
context 9:17 21:15 22:1,11,14,20	58:16 59:23 60:11 61:6 62:2,5 63:7	counters 71:7		114:6,7
	63:25 64:9 65:2	counties 106:3		date 45:20 51:20 63:10 77:11 99:6
		couple 11:12 16:4 88:25 89:14		

dated 93:22	deferral 79:14	deprive 115:25	21:15 100:9	District 1:1,1,7
dates 106:1,2	define 15:20	depth 99:12	differs 39:8	68:14
Daubert 1:6 72:14	defined 6:8 15:2	DEPUTY 81:8	dilute 99:25	doctor 3:1 5:5 6:6
73:1,7,13 74:24	111:19,22	described 11:6 24:5	dint 48:4	7:4 9:4 11:3 14:8
75:17,24,25 76:16	defines 22:2 23:6	31:7 32:11,21	DIRECT 2:3	15:11 16:4 17:1
76:20,21 77:2	definition 11:10	103:15 107:24	direction 40:9	18:20 19:5 20:3
83:14 111:1	15:17,22,23 16:9	description 57:7	directly 13:4 54:22	22:9 24:16 27:11
day 1:6 80:15	21:23 25:18 29:16	107:9	disagree 26:14	28:10 29:8 30:6
120:12	39:7	descriptive 85:18	35:14 80:4 84:15	33:3,14 36:5 37:3
days 12:6 38:14	definitive 12:9	designed 4:8 10:4	85:17 86:6 88:1,2	37:10 38:24 40:12
63:17 107:11	53:13	desk 56:5	89:19 91:12,16	42:17 43:25 44:14
deal 51:25 100:20	deliberate 56:13	despite 40:13 100:2	97:15 102:18	46:4 47:5 49:2
111:12	deliberately 12:1	100:10	disagreed 55:2 64:8	54:3,10,20 56:7
dealing 88:8 89:22	demand 107:13	detail 5:21 24:6	disagreement	57:6 59:3 60:7
deals 87:15	demonstrated 51:3	88:14 90:3 100:3	38:20 84:21	61:23,24 66:8,10
Dealsitrin 34:19	52:4	102:3,4,5 107:12	disagrees 68:2,21	81:20,22 82:13
dealt 76:1 117:13	demonstratively	detailed 68:17 98:1	107:3,20	83:9,19,22 84:6
debated 57:2,6,17	53:18	details 6:3 7:12	disclose 62:21	87:16 88:10 89:18
Decar 63:21,23	Denmark 42:4	33:9 55:8 63:24	disclosed 62:24	90:20 92:4 93:1
Decar's 66:6	58:23 59:4 105:7	determine 98:10	disclosure 63:13	94:19,21 95:5
decide 14:18	105:23 106:3	determined 36:2	discovery 71:13	96:20,23 97:7
deciding 70:23	114:15	72:19	discrepancy 57:17	98:4 114:4
decision 73:13	Denofrio 88:11	diabetics 10:18	discuss 21:10 115:5	doctors 70:22
78:10	90:16	diagnoses 47:20	discussed 13:8 16:2	document 34:9
deck 109:19	depend 24:10 80:14	51:18	21:2 30:22 31:8	80:3,3,5 94:4
decks 110:2	depending 118:24	diagnosis 41:10	31:17 40:16 41:9	documents 54:21
declined 13:12,16	depends 24:9	46:20,21,25 48:23	45:13 48:20 50:8	54:23 57:5 74:3
defect 31:21 53:1	deposition 5:25 6:1	88:19	60:10,16 61:18	75:10,12 80:9
84:13 87:20	31:8 33:14,15	DIANNE 1:9	97:22 98:13 100:3	115:12,13
defects 19:12 24:23	35:3 82:11 117:24	difference 7:22,25	101:15 102:2,6,7	doing 6:17,19,25
26:8,9,18 27:2	118:6	8:3 38:15 62:11	105:9,24 106:4	8:10 30:2 52:8
28:4,17 31:2,23	depositions 6:4	78:25 84:13 100:9	107:11,23 109:23	53:10 54:19 59:16
31:25 38:2 42:6	72:11	104:8	113:5,12,16	71:11,25 72:16
44:9 47:11 51:4	depressed 40:18	different 4:11,13	117:23	76:19 79:8,8,20
53:22 59:15 76:7	41:10 43:1 46:17	7:16,21,24 8:18	discussing 4:3 20:8	dose 21:10,12,15,20
78:8 84:14,17,19	46:23,23,25 51:3	10:5,7,10,16	21:12 29:3	24:14,16 36:6,7
84:23,25 85:24	53:21 101:4	12:10 15:17,22	discussion 7:12	36:14 37:1,13,13
86:1,5 87:18,19	depression 41:10	22:1,1 23:23 24:6	30:20,24 45:9	37:20 38:7,10,12
90:1 92:18 95:12	42:24,25 43:15,15	26:16 27:7,10	49:21,22 50:18	38:13,18,23 39:2
96:2,5 97:1,10,20	43:16 44:1,12,23	40:25 53:18 56:15	60:3	39:6,7,13,14,15
98:9 102:8 106:7	45:4 46:15,20,21	57:9 60:21 68:4	disease 41:25 63:4	40:5,6,9
106:9,20,22	46:22,25 47:4,9	68:24 69:1 70:3,3	88:15,20 89:22	dosing 36:17
defendant 115:9	47:20 48:15,23	70:9,9 71:20 79:3	93:6	doubt 32:22 67:14
Defendants 1:14	49:11 50:3,3,22	94:4 103:11	dispensed 39:15	70:12,13
defense 83:14	50:25 51:18 87:24	104:11	dispute 77:19	Dow 68:11
110:10	101:3,13,24 107:7	differentiate 41:23	distinct 8:5	dozen 44:6
defer 79:13	107:18 113:5,17	differently 4:12	distorted 8:13	Dr 12:17 14:11

15:19,25 16:17 17:5,14,15 19:1 20:13 25:25 54:14 56:12 58:4,6 63:21,23 66:6 67:12,14 68:2,18 68:20 69:3,14,17 70:10,10,13,17 71:21 72:21 73:20 73:21 74:20 75:14 76:14 80:6,10 86:17 87:14 92:5 97:4,16 98:9 100:22 102:2 105:3,19 106:5 107:2,5 108:5 110:1,17,21 111:5 112:6,18 113:23 117:22 118:20 dramatic 48:13 dramatically 104:17 drawn 79:16 DRIVE 1:10 driven 4:21 drop 47:22 dropped 81:19 drug 62:14 drugs 10:17 41:24 99:1 due 28:3 51:11 52:12	112:22 effective 6:25 37:13 41:14 effectively 107:16 effects 19:17 64:18 65:24 efficacy 10:4 efforts 40:13 Eight 91:2 either 35:8 39:14 43:22 66:11 104:10 116:12 117:24 118:2 electronic 1:18 eleven 98:21 elicit 78:22 79:9 eligibility 10:3 Elmo 16:6 else's 13:3 Emmerit 63:21 employ 41:6 employed 45:5 ends 106:14 engaged 63:15 England 45:13 65:16 English 21:25 24:10 enormous 48:13 enormously 39:8 entertain 115:22 entire 76:14 88:6 99:10 105:12,16 entitled 36:7 63:3 entries 60:25 73:21 epidemiologic 84:11 epidemiological 36:10,13,14 87:20 106:9,22 epidemiologist 71:9 104:25 Epstein's 59:13 equal 8:11 100:8 equally 5:14 equation 101:5 erase 56:20	error 18:2 108:6 109:16 especially 106:8,21 ESQ 1:9,11,12,12 1:14 essentially 10:19 69:15 73:23 102:20 117:25 established 31:20 ESTELLE 1:10 estimate 75:8 et 88:11 92:5 evaluate 78:10 evaluating 78:6 events 10:20 everybody 68:5,23 68:25 74:20 everyone's 83:7 evidence 19:15,15 21:19 30:18 36:10 36:13,14,16 44:8 48:9 50:24 51:20 53:23 63:25 71:7 78:22 79:4,15 86:8 97:19 98:3 99:3 102:1 103:23 104:3 109:16 113:8 115:11 117:19 118:2,4 evidently 31:3 exact 43:5 48:14 exactly 7:2 8:7,8,9 10:2 14:14 37:9 52:16 72:20 105:2 examination 69:25 examine 41:16 72:12 108:11 examining 41:18 72:12 example 4:12 7:8 20:6 45:14 53:5 111:7 examples 24:8 Excellent 43:12 exception 91:10,20 91:23 exceptions 10:18	exclusion 6:8 Excuse 40:25 Exhibit 83:13,14 exhibits 110:10,13 exist 36:16 expect 40:10 57:9 experiences 8:14 expert 62:10,15 63:13 69:16 78:13 81:23 82:13,16 86:18 expertise 71:11 82:11 experts 39:8 70:16 112:2,17 explain 24:2 31:17 64:11 78:25,25 explained 50:13 57:17 66:2 explaining 72:6 explanation 57:18 explicit 114:13 explicitly 29:5 66:24 85:1 explore 110:20 exposed 12:5 16:15 28:20 32:8,9 41:11,12 46:1,19 47:20 53:6 84:12 89:23 exposers 50:4 exposure 12:4,9 25:13 53:5 85:3,5 85:16 87:21 98:11 98:17,25 99:14,16 99:16 100:1,9,19 106:10,23 111:6 112:23 114:9 exposures 112:22 expressed 99:13 expressly 100:3 extended 76:23 extent 80:8 101:21 104:11,12 110:7 115:21 118:1,18 extracted 14:24 extreme 47:18	extremely 39:6 99:21 eye 17:6 e-mail 13:13,16,20 54:4,6,11,25 75:2 75:7 e-mails 13:18
<hr/>				
F				
<hr/>				
F 120:1				
facets 80:15				
fact 9:25 12:17,20 12:21 22:8 31:1 34:13 41:13,21 49:14 51:9 52:5 62:21 73:14 74:6 76:11,13 82:16,22 85:20 89:2 93:5 94:8 97:4 104:22 105:24 113:17 114:5				
factor 73:11,16				
factors 35:6 50:4 52:22 73:7				
facts 48:20				
fair 17:7 41:7 51:15 67:4 72:20 75:24 77:25 78:21 87:11 88:6,10 90:1				
fairness 76:24 77:9				
faithfully 68:15				
fall 31:16				
familiar 30:3 43:3 93:7				
far 52:1 107:3				
faulting 77:10				
FDA 55:6,9 66:18 66:21 67:3,17,18 67:19 70:20 71:12 73:17,23 74:3,18 75:1,5,16,21,25 76:2,3,4,15 77:3 78:2,4,8,11,19,19 79:8,15,19,23,24 79:24 80:13 82:12 82:17,23 83:6,20 85:24 86:2,11,16				

86:22 87:2,10 FDA's 71:16 76:8 80:1 83:8 86:16 86:19,23 87:3 feel 81:13 116:9 117:12 feeling 79:5 feet 55:17 69:10 felt 82:19 105:16 fetal 88:19 89:22 figure 47:5,7 64:24 65:16 80:24 file 75:9 filed 62:18 files 77:23 fill 11:16 12:4 filled 11:15,18 12:2 12:7 filling 16:15 final 55:2 80:2 110:17 Finally 55:17 find 36:11 43:6 50:23 77:23 101:25 104:2 107:25 116:5 finding 24:23 27:18 30:21 31:9 32:17 32:25 45:1 49:25 56:25 57:4,16 60:18 103:16 findings 20:9 23:22 24:13,17 25:15 27:14 29:10,12 30:8,17 35:25 56:8,12,15 58:13 77:4 94:9 95:7 96:22 103:17 finds 78:7 fine 8:10 29:6,7 46:9 54:12 80:5 81:3 87:2 94:5 116:15 119:5 finish 14:9 first 5:17 11:9,15 11:16 12:6 19:11 26:15 37:2 38:1	39:14 44:1,5 48:21 49:17 50:20 63:6 64:8 69:17 71:21 72:24 73:8 74:11 75:11 84:12 85:3,4,5,16 87:21 90:14 105:9 106:10,16,23 113:10 fits 29:14 five 37:5,6 73:25 86:5,10 97:9 floating 110:18 FLOM 1:14 Fluoxetine 40:1 96:4 focus 4:1 15:12 24:17 54:10 112:10 focused 3:23 40:15 42:6 focusing 58:24 folks 117:6 follow 68:3 75:3,8 115:23 followed 70:24 following 99:7 footing 56:15 100:8 force 116:25 foreign 71:15 forest 35:16,24 55:10 60:25 61:10 form 47:18 54:21 65:4,17 104:19 109:16 formal 4:7 formally 118:1 forth 12:12 55:6 64:7 74:11 75:5,7 fortuity 74:8 fortunate 3:10 forward 42:11,13 79:17 Foster 6:2 found 32:18 37:1 38:5 45:6 53:25 64:6 82:22 88:3	95:11,12 96:2 103:8 foundational 79:22 86:25 four 1:15 63:17 69:20 fourth 96:23 frankly 75:17 77:20 frequently 95:13 96:3 front 11:11 44:17 59:19 92:17 Frye 54:7 73:10 111:1 117:25 118:7,9 full 47:13 funded 93:5,12,15 93:15 funders 93:7 further 50:20 114:24,25 Furu 45:21,22,23 future 14:18 112:19	74:13 106:2 gives 5:11 34:10 47:23,24 70:25 85:22 giving 71:2 106:1 glad 81:16 glasses 8:3 go 3:1,14 4:6 5:20 9:4,17 11:13 12:23 14:6 18:5 19:1,14 20:23 21:11 22:24 24:6 24:22 25:22 26:1 28:8,11,19 29:8,9 30:2,24 33:7,25 36:20 37:2,16 38:7 39:10,10 41:15 42:20 43:2 43:14 44:13 48:1 49:15 50:7,7 52:21 54:2 55:10 57:14 59:6 60:13 65:4 67:3,13 70:4 75:9 77:17 82:4 83:17,22 87:15 89:5 90:5 93:9,10 94:17 95:5,11 96:15 97:7 99:18 107:6 goes 6:10 21:18 going 4:5,11 9:6 10:11 16:24 20:25 22:25 26:1 27:7 27:11 29:25 33:9 35:12 39:9 40:7 40:15 42:19 45:10 45:10 52:13 53:17 54:2 55:15,15,22 57:22 58:6,23 67:8,10,13 68:23 69:5,7 70:5 71:16 73:7 78:12,17 79:3,9 80:19 83:13 109:23 114:12 117:15,22 good 20:16 30:2 43:9 62:3 81:10	81:11 84:1 90:8 92:10 94:24 115:25 gotcha 78:1 gotten 71:13,19 76:18 great 27:12 30:14 54:13 73:5 100:3 100:20 102:3 107:12 greater 5:21 group 16:14 31:2 31:19 40:23,23 41:14 42:7 46:18 46:19 grouping 30:24 groups 47:20 guess 22:11 26:24 55:11 72:9,22 118:23 guidance 115:23 guys 4:14
H				
half 98:17,23,24,25 99:2 hand 7:21,25 67:2 120:11 handle 116:15 handwriting 16:8 handy 20:14 happen 77:4 117:20 happened 47:14 103:12 107:9 happening 103:21 happens 5:20 35:9 happy 18:5 24:2 43:23 82:20 hard 34:2 39:2 108:1 118:16 Harvard 45:16,18 45:19 hat 10:22 heading 96:22 hear 74:25 77:6 80:17				

heard 10:8 70:13 75:11 82:15 92:7	honestly 10:20 Honor 3:5 18:4,14 20:12,16 29:21 30:1 56:3 67:6,8 68:6,12 69:8,11 70:13,25 71:18 72:12,21 73:7,12 73:23 74:17,23 76:10 77:5 78:10 79:21 80:22 81:4 81:11 83:9 86:14 86:22 87:11 89:11 98:5,7 108:15 109:22 110:6,11 114:2 115:7,10,16 115:21 116:25 117:17,19 119:9	hypotheticals 75:22 <hr/> I <hr/> idea 7:17,20 10:9 14:19 48:4 53:21 74:15 identical 9:25 10:2 34:15 ignore 34:17 52:6 ignored 51:19 72:6 97:18 imagine 52:23 105:7 108:1 impact 47:25 48:6 48:7 51:21 52:2,9 52:20 53:11,19 60:6 99:24 implies 19:16 important 10:8 19:16 48:13 51:6 51:25 60:3 82:19 100:20 importantly 102:19 impossible 80:10 imprecise 8:21 impressed 116:8,11 improper 4:18 inability 88:4 inaccuracies 99:22 inaccuracy 99:24 inaccurate 57:7 99:21 inadvertently 109:17 inappropriate 86:8 include 25:14 60:17 included 105:23 includes 35:16 including 40:1 inclusion 6:8 inconclusive 84:20 86:7 inconsistency 5:23 incorrect 5:17 17:11 108:23 increase 19:11	29:17 38:17,18 44:23 52:25 84:19 85:12 101:13,22 102:21 increased 8:15 20:9 21:4,12,13 24:19 24:24 25:12,18,22 26:7 32:18 36:17 39:3 44:8 45:6,11 51:3 53:22 55:3 87:18 88:2 91:8 91:16,19 97:24 101:23 104:23 106:7,20 increases 44:25 50:25 84:25 88:7 89:25 increasing 36:17 independent 72:14 104:3,13 111:25 independently 11:7 87:24 indicate 91:8 indicated 4:11 12:14 13:2,13 15:24 25:16,17 61:13 82:25 indication 37:19 40:16,17 41:2,17 41:18 48:1,12,19 50:3,4,19 51:2,6 51:13,22,24 52:10 53:20,20 54:1 88:5,8 101:23 107:7,14,25 113:11,22 indiscernible 6:8 16:6,20 34:3 55:16 60:19 67:7 67:7 68:11 73:10 73:10 90:11 95:11 114:16 116:16 indistinguishable 38:8 52:5 individual 5:4 38:4 45:9 individuals 40:23	infants 89:23 infarction 111:8,14 Inference 112:13 influence 4:19,20 60:5 informal 23:14 information 3:14 3:24 4:3 10:25 31:11 32:22 40:4 46:8 72:18 73:24 74:1,2,4,5,7,11,12 74:16,19,19 76:8 76:25 77:22 78:5 79:9 104:10 114:11 115:17 informed 104:4 ing 40:16 inhibitors 90:21 initial 73:24 insufficient 107:8 intend 17:17 interest 62:24 83:5 83:7 interested 8:22 98:19 105:8 120:6 interesting 12:19 13:21 14:12 64:6 internal 54:3,6,20 55:8 interpret 5:16 92:19 interpretation 5:17 63:19 interpreting 5:1,11 interrupt 72:2 interval 31:14 32:20 85:14 108:8 intervals 28:21 47:10 85:15 109:18 interview 98:18 99:19,21 interviewed 99:1 interviewing 99:19 interviews 98:15 99:17 100:6 114:5 114:23
---	--	--	--	--

investigated 90:22 91:6,7	36:25 37:2,4,12 37:16 38:1,11,19	17:19 18:10 20:12 20:15 23:6 27:16	language 26:1 83:6 83:9 86:2,19,23	93:9 94:13,17
investigation 50:21 65:12	39:8,25 41:17 42:3,20 50:9	37:8,9 38:15 40:16 42:15,16	87:1,3 97:8 107:24	95:10 96:15 109:7 115:5
investigator 11:25	58:14,14,15,15	49:2,4 51:9 52:1	large 10:18 45:1	level 38:16 99:23
investigators 10:20 41:1 46:13	59:4 104:7,9,17 113:13 114:15	54:25 55:5,8 59:25 66:17 67:19	larger 31:2,19	LIABILITY 1:4
investigator's 11:24 12:12	Jimenez-Solem's 104:14	67:22 68:8,18 75:6 76:10 77:1,8	largest 45:19,24,25 51:21	Liaison 1:14
involved 5:2 13:10	job 30:2	79:23 80:1,18 82:24 83:19 86:16	late 38:3 75:9	life 6:20
ischemia 111:13,22	John 63:6	86:18 90:8,25 91:22,23 92:16	Latin 12:21,22	Lilly 34:15
isolation 31:1,11 32:21 45:10 97:17	Joint 88:15	93:14,24 98:11,16 99:24 103:14	law 86:15 87:3	limit 47:8 117:8
issue 35:6 39:24 40:15 41:20 45:16	JOSEPH 1:11	104:15 107:22 108:3,4 109:22	Laweek 57:13,15	limitation 64:24
49:11 51:11 55:9 64:17 65:19 69:11	journal 45:13 62:23 63:3,18	111:3 114:13,21 116:9 117:21	Laweek's 58:2	limitations 9:22 10:13 61:25
70:16 73:6 79:14 79:22 83:7 89:22	Judea 112:16	knowing 97:25 105:11	lawyers 13:11 63:14 82:16,22	limited 36:16 39:6 87:22 88:4 111:6
100:19 107:21 108:11	Judge 1:7 3:9,19 77:17	knowledge 74:9	88:25	117:8
issues 10:8 35:5 71:20 105:8 108:5	judged 65:12	known 6:21 99:21 114:8	lay 47:24	limiting 47:3
111:17 112:7	judgment 72:25	knows 13:7 53:10 80:6 115:16	Lead 1:14	line 6:6 9:8,13,18 22:25,25 23:2
	juice 6:17,18		leading 112:16	33:19 35:4 39:4
	June 82:23		leads 14:17	64:7 67:9 80:19
	jury 31:4,18		learned 38:14 66:17 72:17	87:9 110:17
			leaves 60:9	lines 73:21
J	K	L	lecture 111:17,18	lining 79:2
jam 10:22	Kalen 29:11 34:19	label 67:3,18 70:20 75:6,20,25 76:3	led 19:20,22 26:11 67:18 75:5	link 51:1
Janine 1:17 120:14	Katsopolis 54:15 73:21	77:3 78:9,12,24 82:5,9,10 83:3,6,9	left 18:22 26:16,17	links 96:5,24
January 74:5,7 78:3	keep 86:17	83:21 86:17,17 87:1,3,4,14 106:5	left-hand 27:4 60:16	Lipitor 64:19
Jewell 2:3 25:25 68:2,18,20 69:17	keeping 77:14	106:6,6,13	lend 6:14	list 25:15,16,16,18 27:5,13 29:9,16
70:10,13 71:21 74:20 76:14 80:6	key 9:21 43:25 64:17 94:9	labeled 108:20	length 31:13 56:14 60:16 85:21 99:18	29:16 79:2 81:23
80:10 87:14 98:9 100:22 102:2	kid 112:4	labeling 66:18 71:12,14 74:13,22	let's 3:1 4:6 5:14,25 8:4 9:4,16 11:12	83:3 88:10,23
105:3,19 106:5 108:5 110:17,21	Kimmel 17:5 107:3 107:5 117:22	76:11 82:12	20:9 22:21,24 24:16,16,21 25:10	92:4 93:20,21,22
111:5 112:6,18 113:23	118:20	lack 22:6 37:19 38:23	25:22,22 28:10 29:25 30:2 33:14	94:1,3 96:10 113:4
Jewell's 16:9 20:13 67:12,14 69:4,14	kin 120:5	lacking 51:1	36:24 37:2,23 39:10,10 41:15	listen 89:9
70:10,17 73:20 75:14 86:18 110:1	kind 22:10 23:10 47:25 71:25 76:24	ladies 70:23	42:14 45:15 47:5 49:15 51:15 52:24	listening 89:7
Jimenez-Solem 15:7,18,23 16:20	115:21 118:16	Lafadda 75:7,11 77:21	54:2 55:10 57:15 57:22 58:17 59:3	lists 27:8
18:24 21:20 36:21	kinds 5:22 73:14 89:25 107:14	LANCASTER 1:10	59:6,24 66:16,25 67:3,7 83:8,22	literature 5:16 42:2 53:19 54:17 55:6
	knew 34:8 52:20 105:6,6,8,17		85:2 87:15 90:4	62:14 64:21 65:22
	know 3:17 4:12 11:25 13:9 17:3,9			68:17,22,22 76:12 103:14
				litigation 1:4 62:10 62:20 63:14 78:11
				little 4:14,22 9:17 12:20,22 15:12
				21:14 23:13,13 24:5 31:15 40:17

43:18 52:4 53:24 53:25 57:7 74:18 75:18 81:14 88:14 102:1 105:13 109:16 118:19 lived 6:20 lives 80:16 Lloyd 34:20 LLP 1:14 locate 39:18 logs 17:5 long 6:21 15:11,11 27:20 longer 30:20 look 3:14 5:25 8:6 11:8 13:18 16:25 20:10 22:19 25:23 26:1 28:9,10 33:7 34:2 36:20,24 38:9 42:7,14 43:5 44:4,13 46:5,7 49:14,15 51:15 58:12,17 59:3 66:16 74:18 78:4 83:8 89:5 90:2,5 98:3,14 100:18 103:13,20 108:2 113:20 looked 12:25 68:16 72:18 74:19 76:4 76:8,12 94:11 96:11 104:21,22 106:2,3 112:21 looking 21:2 33:10 34:5 47:22 51:6 56:1 59:14 72:16 72:17 74:21 77:21 103:5,6 104:25 105:7 looks 17:11 22:16 93:16 96:11 loosely 23:10 lost 95:6 lot 3:24,25 23:17 30:20 40:12 45:9 47:13 83:11 86:9 99:15 115:17	116:25 117:5,5 Louis 6:2 lovely 55:21 low 19:16 38:10,11 39:7 40:4 63:3 lower 19:7 97:23 104:17,18 Luick 29:11 34:1 60:13,13,19,21 76:23 114:21,22 lumped 101:22 lunch 18:7,8 108:10 lurch 18:12 Lusk 73:13 <hr/> M M 1:6 magical 8:18 main 19:22,23 96:22 major 11:7 38:4,6 44:19 52:1 84:13 84:14,16,19 101:12 making 40:2 62:7 69:25 malformations 36:15 38:3,4,6 85:13,14 87:25 manage 84:3 managed 41:23 manufacturer 111:22 March 78:2 mark 1:14 83:13 marked 83:10 Market 1:21 masked 86:9 materials 72:5 82:9 maternal 26:6 44:23 49:1 50:25 99:17,19,20 100:5 101:13 114:23 matter 117:2 118:14 Maum 29:11 30:3,8	30:18 31:6,9,10 32:2,6,16 34:19 MBDPS 93:14 MCA 44:19 101:10 101:11,13,17 McDonough 6:10 MEAGHER 1:14 mean 16:14 17:14 17:23 21:25 22:1 23:8 29:12 33:5 56:21 75:2 86:12 91:13 99:21 101:11 110:13 meaning 21:16 means 12:21 46:25 75:18 measure 8:22 12:4 12:9 99:15 100:8 104:13 114:8 measured 100:19 measures 100:1 mechanism 50:1 med 6:7 medical 45:17 62:14,23 63:2 66:11 70:22 medications 19:18 95:14 96:4 99:8 medicine 62:7 70:23 medicines 43:1 medium 40:6 meets 72:14 membership 31:19 memory 3:17,25 4:2 33:25 43:19 54:9,13 89:6,21 90:1 98:14 114:22 mention 84:22 91:14 mentioned 36:5 54:11 104:2 112:9 Merrell 68:11 metaphor 8:5 meta-analyses 10:23 11:4 meta-analysis 4:8	4:10,24 5:7,15,23 6:14,15,25 8:10 8:15,17,19,20,24 9:22,24 11:5 16:19 17:19,21 18:23 85:11,19,21 85:22 86:4 100:7 method 41:17 56:16 57:3,5,10 57:11,19 68:12,15 107:16 114:10,21 methodologically 103:5,19 107:15 107:19 108:1 methodologies 67:10,13 68:7,19 68:20 70:1,9 71:1 79:3 methodology 19:20 26:11 45:4 62:11 67:12 68:4 69:2,4 69:13 70:11,24 72:13,19,19 73:15 75:15 78:7 98:3 100:18 104:25 107:13 methods 11:24 12:12 40:25 41:6 41:15 69:14,14,21 69:23 75:17 80:7 80:9,10 99:17 middle 9:15 14:10 76:20 MID-ATLANTIC 1:20 Miles 6:9 85:20,22 86:4,6,11 106:19 million 45:20,22 mind 37:8 56:13 mini 11:5 18:23 minimize 41:1 minimum 109:25 minute 17:4 80:15 94:19 95:15 minutes 17:8 18:13 misclassification 35:5	misinterpreting 6:12 mislead 5:2 8:25 misleading 5:20,21 6:22 misleads 5:18 missing 51:1 misspoke 114:17 mistakes 4:18 mix 6:18 10:6 mixing 7:5,10,15 7:15 8:13 9:20 10:14,14,15 model 113:1 modified 64:10 moment 29:21 monotonically 21:18 months 55:7 73:25 98:16,21,22,22 99:5 morning 45:13 57:6 80:20 105:9 106:4 109:11 115:14 mother 98:15 99:1 mothers 46:16,17 46:21 89:23 move 18:4 20:3 29:7,25 37:23 50:19 60:21 79:16 80:21 85:2 109:24 118:3,19 moved 60:15 74:9 100:1 moves 85:6 multiple 8:16 29:13 31:23 61:10 66:21 66:22 81:11 119:9 muscle 65:18 myocardial 111:7 111:13,13,22 myopathy 65:4,18 <hr/> N N 2:1 name 92:6 99:7
---	---	--	--	---

112:12 named 78:18 NAST 1:9 National 1:20 97:20 98:9 nationwide 42:3 105:23 nature 31:25 64:16 66:1 71:25 nauseam 107:11 Nearly 45:20 necessarily 75:13 104:23 necessary 50:22 62:4 64:15 65:25 116:9,22 need 14:14,15 40:13,14 42:20,22 48:14 51:2 70:4 77:17 80:17,17,18 86:21 94:22 108:14 116:9 117:6,9,9,14 118:9,12 negative 23:15 neither 120:5 network 77:14 never 71:13 115:25 new 1:15,15 12:15 41:17 45:13 65:14 65:15,16 79:6 91:15 92:19 95:6 97:24 104:9,10,17 104:24 105:13 112:9 nice 4:16 NICHOLAS 2:3 nine 98:22 noise 52:8 nonsignificant 20:8 20:11 21:4 25:12 30:8 44:11 47:4 47:10 102:21,24 103:2,6,13,16,20 nonspecificity 49:25 nonstatistically	23:21 24:13,17 25:17 27:13,21 29:10,14 32:17 57:3 non-significance 24:15 non-statistical 29:12 notable 10:18 Notary 1:17 120:14 note 49:11 notebook 109:25 noted 26:17 noticed 76:22 81:16 number 3:16,18 15:19,22 28:3,19 32:13 34:16 39:25 44:16 45:1 61:2 64:20,21 65:2,11 65:14,20 66:2 73:18 83:23 90:12 90:23 94:22 106:12,14 107:3 numbered 49:20 numbers 17:20 46:2 58:8 85:20 Nursing 88:19 <hr/> O <hr/> Obesity 49:1 object 59:11 67:8 118:14 objection 89:11 110:4,18,19 objections 110:6,9 observation 3:16 observational 3:14 3:18 4:3 9:24,24 40:19 61:24 observe 39:13 observed 87:20 88:6 96:6 97:1 106:9,22 obstacle 6:13,13,16 6:18 81:13 obtaining 114:10 obviously 115:18	117:7 118:14 occur 95:12 96:2 occurred 65:24 October 63:8 78:3 odds 5:13,14,16,19 5:19 8:23 16:10 16:20 24:23 28:20 28:20 32:10 34:14 34:14,15 38:5,10 38:12 40:4 47:4 47:10,21,23 48:14 51:18,23 52:2,3 53:17,25 57:14 60:2,4 85:13,14 103:8 104:16 108:20 official 120:11 offspring 85:16 oh 3:21 9:5 17:23 39:18 42:22 49:17 52:13 56:22 58:24 75:15 83:17 85:6 93:10 95:8,8 109:14 113:4 114:18 okay 3:9 4:5,17 7:18 9:7,8 11:19 17:9,13 18:8 19:4 20:24 21:22 22:2 22:8,21 23:3,20 25:2,10,24 26:2 28:7,13,23 32:2,6 32:9,24 33:3,11 33:14,21 35:24 36:5 37:4,6,9 38:21 39:10,13,20 39:23 42:18,22,24 44:7,10,12,18 45:24 46:1,4,5 47:7,8 48:21 49:5 51:5 54:10,16,17 55:5,12,14 56:11 56:18,24 57:20 58:10,22,24,25 59:2,6,24 61:23 66:10 79:1 80:1 80:22 81:21,22	83:8,9,14,21,25 84:5,10,18 85:9 87:18 89:7,15 90:18,25 91:2,8 91:17 92:4,15 93:11,24 94:4,4,6 94:15,20 95:8,24 96:1,15 97:7,7 98:4 99:9 100:16 103:19 106:15 107:6 108:18 114:14,20 116:2 old 86:5 oldest 69:18 once 111:18 ones 48:2 61:7 64:6 84:23 118:8 one-page 70:2,2 ongoing 54:18 online 15:1 96:11 96:14 open 92:17 opened 98:15 opening 66:15,20 69:17 73:23 openings 116:6 OPERATOR 1:16 1:16 opinion 5:8 28:25 66:6,9 83:7 84:16 89:9 91:13 104:5 106:11,24 opinions 54:21 89:10 opposing 78:13 80:6 102:23 orange 6:16,17 7:20 8:4 oranges 7:5,11,15 9:20 10:15 order 82:5 114:5 organization 69:16 organizations 66:11 67:11 68:3 68:16 70:8 72:17 73:5 organized 30:1	orient 56:7 original 46:8 originally 46:16 Otis 70:2,25 ought 51:25 outcome 40:20,23 52:24 120:6 outcomes 112:21 outside 72:10 78:14 79:3 overall 18:25 19:2 26:22 27:24 38:21 44:19 83:22 84:10 84:10 101:10 104:18 overlap 61:18,19 103:24,25 104:4,8 105:11,12 overlapping 61:17 overnight 80:17 117:16 Overruled 89:12 overstate 51:18 62:6 64:2 overstated 64:8 66:7 overstatement 65:2 overstating 62:14 64:25 over-interpret 66:4 <hr/> P <hr/> P 16:11 PA 1:3,10 page 2:1 6:6 9:5,8 9:10,11,15,18 19:3,4,7,14 20:6,7 20:10 21:3,11 22:24,25 25:11,14 25:22 26:3 28:11 28:15,24 29:2,8 30:5 33:17,18 34:5,6,18 35:2 36:6 37:2,4,16 39:11,13,25 44:9 44:14,15,17,17 46:6 47:5 49:16
---	---	--	---	--

49:16,19 67:4 68:5,24 69:19 83:23 84:2,10 85:2,3,6 87:16 90:5,23 91:1 92:25,25 93:9 94:22,22 95:5,19 96:15,16,18,18,18 97:5,7 99:5 106:12,18 117:8 pages 24:22 49:19 117:5 paid 62:15 pain 65:18 paper 13:3 15:7 28:12 33:7 43:2,5 49:4,9,10,13,19 53:23 57:12,16,18 58:6 60:21 62:19 62:25 63:8 64:5 65:1,6,21 69:19 70:2,2,14 92:17 94:12 98:14,19 101:8 105:9,20 106:2 116:25 papers 33:8 57:24 66:12 103:22 112:20,24 114:12 paragraph 38:1 49:16,17 50:8,11 50:17,20 95:6,9 106:17 parameters 80:19 parent 85:19 parentheses 39:20 Paroxetine 40:1 44:24 45:7 91:10 92:1 96:4 part 11:19,23 12:11 23:20 30:8 54:17 54:25 55:5 67:23 67:24 69:22 71:12 73:22 74:23 78:10 79:22 100:17,18 100:20 103:23 107:1 partially 61:18	particular 10:12,12 11:22 12:15 31:25 32:1 40:18 48:12 53:12 61:13 79:14 111:21 particularly 51:13 62:9 75:14 97:11 104:7 party 78:14 120:6 pass 72:25 passed 110:25 path 69:1 patients 70:25 Paul 77:21 pause 15:6,18 16:9 paused 11:6 15:3,4 15:16,20,22 16:14 20:1 41:19 42:7 Paxil 45:7 91:18,20 92:2 99:10 pay 5:10 Pearl 112:16 peculiar 10:12 peer 11:20,21 12:12 19:20,23 26:11 57:16,23,24 64:21 70:20,21 71:1,4 72:14 pen 59:19 pending 6:2 Pennsylvania 1:1 1:21 people 8:25 63:3 64:19,22 65:3,10 65:15,17 71:15,24 79:1 people's 72:10 percent 45:11 47:22 48:10,14,14 51:19 52:2,7,12 52:13,22 60:4 65:3,17 85:13,15 97:11,18 102:20 104:23 106:11 percentage 65:24 perception 12:8 perfect 81:2 92:18	perfectly 6:7 44:5 65:13 73:12 78:23 performed 11:13 46:13 48:16 period 98:17 periodic 54:7 permits 87:8 permitted 117:24 person 37:8 personal 116:13 personally 58:11 105:7 perspective 112:8 pesticide 112:23 Petersen 34:19 51:10 58:14 104:8 104:10,19 105:6,8 105:11,14,15,21 105:22 Pfizer 54:3,20 55:8 64:19 67:17,20 69:12 74:2,4 75:5 86:22 88:25 Pfizer's 55:2 67:19 77:4 79:24 82:6 86:17,19 87:4 90:12 ph 6:7,10 16:6 29:11,11,11 34:1 34:19 42:14 49:3 49:3 54:15 60:3 61:21,21 63:21 73:13 75:7 Pharmaceuticals 68:11 pharmacy 114:16 phenomena 10:9 phenomenon 8:21 8:22 Philadelphia 1:3,21 31:5 physical 6:18 picked 26:20 27:25 picture 23:12 pie 16:5,7 108:19 piece 69:19 74:18 place 21:6 29:3	34:2 places 10:5,7 20:4 plaintiff 63:13 115:6 plaintiffs 74:1,14 Plaintiff's 1:9 plaintiff's 73:17 76:1,5 plan 115:5 play 13:9 please 13:18 19:2 67:3 78:25 81:12 87:16 90:5,23 102:6 104:2 plot 35:16,24 55:10 61:1,10 plus 98:21 point 8:23,24 13:18 20:16 21:19 22:6 32:23,24 43:23,24 56:14 57:25 58:19 63:15 64:23 68:3 68:10 71:21 72:9 72:11 74:17 76:3 77:9 82:10 86:12 94:24 105:5,10 pointed 15:25 56:13 61:16 101:10 pointing 27:10 35:9 points 63:23 police 67:25 politely 13:12,16 population 10:2,3 10:13 15:20 52:14 52:21 53:3,3,7,13 93:3,4 103:25 104:24 populations 10:10 84:15 87:23 104:4 posed 79:19 80:19 position 66:12 76:6 79:18 83:5 positive 21:5,7 22:7 23:15 25:13 30:10 44:11 possibility 13:22	possibly 8:1 22:18 30:25 94:2 97:25 98:1 post 12:18,20 18:22 98:17 posted 94:9 postings 94:14 97:16 postpone 75:16 postponed 80:20 post-delivery 98:16 post-hearing 115:22,24 potential 89:25 99:25 105:13 108:6 practice 62:3 practiced 68:12 practitioners 70:22 precise 16:14 65:5 precisely 15:19 80:18 precision 8:15,23 31:15 preclude 117:15 predicated 53:21 prefer 57:15,22,25 109:19 pregnancies 41:11 46:16 pregnancy 12:2 26:7 41:19 70:24 83:22 84:8 90:22 91:5 95:14 96:4 97:12 112:18,21 113:1 pregnant 84:11 112:23 premise 79:9 87:6 prepared 66:12 prescription 11:15 11:16 12:2,5,6 prescriptions 11:18 16:15 44:24 101:14 present 69:5,7 118:4
--	--	---	--	--

presented 63:25	48:18	purposes 78:6	105:20 106:6	readers 47:24
presenting 62:4	properly 4:9	109:25	quoted 38:5 108:23	reading 20:11 25:8
69:6	proposal 67:19	pursed 71:1	quotes 15:4,16	95:15,17,17
presents 68:13	75:6 79:24	pursuing 68:1	<hr/> R <hr/>	real 32:21 71:4,23
presiding 81:9	propose 75:19	put 3:22 6:5 15:4	R 120:1	realized 105:12
press 96:12,14	proposed 66:18	15:16 27:4,6 29:1	raising 63:18	realizing 66:4
presumably 67:10	67:3,18 74:13	35:18,20 48:5	randomized 3:10	really 10:22 15:11
pretty 5:7 6:24	75:5,20 83:8,21	52:9,16,17 54:12	3:20,23 4:1	15:12 22:6,8
Prevention 93:6	86:23 87:1 106:6	56:14 66:12,19,23	rare 30:24 31:18	23:10 31:12,15,24
97:21 98:9	107:24	67:1 73:18 76:9	32:15	32:21 39:6 49:2
previous 12:6	prospectively	91:15 106:19	rate 84:14	55:8,24 58:21,21
16:22 83:10 92:20	99:20	putting 4:16 14:21	rated 99:22	60:6 69:23 70:15
97:1	prove 31:1	71:8 99:6	ratio 5:13,14,16,19	71:10 74:16 76:22
previously 60:13	provide 29:4	puzzle 74:18	5:19 8:23 16:10	76:24 77:7 85:1
88:9 97:9	104:19 110:2,7	100:21	16:20 24:23 28:20	90:2 116:4 117:14
prime 6:24	113:8	P.C 1:9	28:20 32:11 34:14	reanalysis 11:14
Primer 112:13	provided 35:11	p.m 18:17,17 81:7	34:14,15 38:12	12:18 13:1 16:7
print 3:8	67:21 104:9	81:7 119:13	40:4 47:5,10,21	17:15 18:25
prior 41:12,21	provides 86:16	<hr/> Q <hr/>	47:23 48:14 51:18	reason 10:4 31:7
117:24 118:21	104:9	qualifications	51:23 52:2,3	35:14 56:14 62:22
probably 8:6 20:5	proxy 69:16	110:19,21,24	53:17,25 57:14	118:17
28:8 53:9 75:20	Prozac 33:14,15	question 10:21,25	60:2,5 85:13,15	reasonable 78:23
76:10 93:8 99:17	34:25 35:13 99:10	11:8,23 14:8	103:8 108:20	reasonably 71:11
105:6	PSE 77:16,19 110:5	15:13 23:5 24:3	ratios 38:5,10	reasons 86:8 99:18
problem 5:6 7:5	117:4	35:12 38:9 42:16	104:16	reassuring 97:9
45:5 78:16 117:21	PSURs 73:22	56:12 75:19 77:2	raw 14:15 17:25	reassuringly 96:16
proceeding 18:17	pub 6:7	78:15 79:9 80:2	18:1	96:20,24
81:7 119:12	Public 1:17 120:14	82:18 84:1 90:8	reach 68:4 70:2,3	recall 6:3 7:9,12
Proceedings 1:18	publication 11:22	98:18,19,24 99:11	80:7 110:19	33:9 49:11 63:17
process 4:10 6:15	14:17 92:23	107:5 108:2	reached 67:11	81:22 86:4 89:5
57:24,24 70:4	publish 13:6 14:1,6	questioning 67:9	68:19 70:8 110:21	100:24 103:24
71:15 78:1 80:16	published 11:20	110:17	read 7:1,2 9:1 11:1	108:9 111:22,23
produce 77:24	12:12 13:1 17:16	questions 15:10	19:12,13,18 20:24	113:6,14 114:12
produced 1:19	19:20,23 26:11	68:1 79:6,19	23:18,19,24 26:9	received 110:8
production 75:9	53:18 57:4,11,16	80:18,20 87:9	28:21 34:21 35:3	recess 18:12,16
PRODUCTS 1:4	58:1 63:2,8 64:21	88:24 89:14 90:2	35:4 36:3,17,19	80:24 81:5,6
profession 21:23	65:6,14,16 84:11	98:25 103:25	37:8,11,14,20	recollection 3:2,15
Professor 104:24	87:20 88:3 92:22	114:1	38:1,11 39:15,17	32:2 33:11 34:23
105:3	106:9,22 112:6,14	quick 25:3 49:14	39:18 45:2 50:5,6	record 72:5 79:16
proffered 70:8	112:18,20 113:2	71:19 72:22 90:5	50:13 52:6 53:23	82:16 86:15
progeny 73:14	pull 10:22 30:5	quicker 118:19	70:14 75:2 82:10	109:25 110:3
progress 41:5	78:1 95:10	quickly 43:6 45:15	84:18 88:21 91:10	112:24 119:1
projects 13:17	pulled 10:19 40:3	68:6 76:10 83:19	94:18 95:24 96:7	recorded 1:18
prominently 41:9	pulling 45:8	quite 7:21 29:5	96:8 97:1,13	recording 1:18
promise 15:8	pullout 95:20	105:18	98:12 119:3	120:4
pronounce 49:2	purchase 8:19	quote 65:5 101:7	reader 65:8,20	records 80:5
propensity 48:17	purpose 8:19			114:16

recross 2:3 113:25	registries 105:23	109:19	reserve 118:24	57:16 64:21 68:22
red 23:13 56:9,19	114:15	replaced 60:18,20	resolve 5:23	70:17,20,21 85:25
61:7	regretted 65:8	109:21	resort 5:23	86:1,2,12 93:19
redirect 2:3 15:14	regulatory 82:13	replicated 10:10	respect 39:14,15	94:15 103:22
98:6	rejected 12:25,25	replication 104:13	61:25 72:21	reviewers 57:25
reduce 52:3	related 24:3 84:23	104:20 105:1,17	respond 67:25 69:9	reviewing 34:9
reduces 52:2	89:3	report 3:19,22,23	response 21:11,15	55:6
reduction 52:12	relation 35:13 36:6	4:2,2 5:15 20:4,7	21:20 24:14,16	reviews 72:13
Reese 34:19 61:21	50:23	20:7,13 21:3,6,11	36:6,7,14 37:1,14	rheumatoid 112:25
refer 7:20 9:22	relationship 37:2	24:22 25:6,7,11	38:7,18 39:2,6,14	rid 113:21
20:4,8 21:3 24:15	37:20 38:23 39:14	26:1 27:7,13 28:3	40:9 63:18 65:1	right 3:11,21 4:5,6
32:16 38:21 39:22	53:4	28:8 29:3,5,9 30:5	74:2	4:9 5:5 7:6,9,21
64:20 66:21	relatively 98:13	32:5 34:3,4,10,13	responsible 87:4	7:22 8:2 9:4,16
reference 21:11	115:16	36:7 38:10 39:5	rest 16:2 97:18	11:5,12,17,20,23
referenced 54:3	release 96:12,14	40:3 44:9 45:11	restricted 44:1,12	12:21 13:8,12
references 63:25	released 82:20	47:15,15 48:5,11	45:4 46:18,20,22	14:4,19,19,22,25
86:11	relevant 69:23	52:17 54:8,23	47:4,9 48:15	15:1,10,23 16:11
referencing 12:19	73:16 75:14,24	62:19 67:23,24	101:3 113:5,17	16:16,17,25 17:1
65:21	76:15 101:17,21	70:11 73:20 77:1	restricting 47:19	17:9,16,19 18:3
referred 12:17	104:14	78:14 81:23 82:23	51:17	19:9 20:6,9 21:5
118:15	reliable 68:4 69:4	83:4 94:1 99:13	result 21:3 27:5,21	21:10,13,17 22:5
referring 41:8 49:4	72:18 114:8	100:4 101:25	28:24,24 29:2	22:13,25 24:1,12
62:16 68:7 85:20	reliance 81:23 82:9	102:3 107:11	35:21 45:8 52:11	24:13,18 25:10,15
93:25 97:8	83:3 88:10,23	110:1	53:14 57:2,4	25:19,25 26:19,23
refers 16:14 40:6	92:4 93:20,21,22	reported 28:2,24	60:11 102:19,24	27:1,7,14,18 28:1
93:14	94:1 96:10	30:21 31:5,9 32:3	104:14,18 108:23	28:5,10,17 29:3
reflect 21:3 62:3	relied 73:2 74:4	32:3,7,22 38:18	results 4:18 5:3,11	29:25 30:3,9,12
64:15 65:25	119:1	39:7 47:19 59:15	18:1,25 19:2,10	31:22 32:6,9,25
reflecting 105:15	relies 66:21	61:14 84:18,24	25:11,17 27:25	33:6 34:2 35:12
reflection 64:22	rely 5:3 30:25 31:1	97:9,23 104:19	28:2 29:17 33:4	35:17,22 36:5,8
reflects 25:11 85:24	31:19 36:20 68:12	reporting 1:20	35:7,10,19 36:3	36:10,24 37:7,12
refresh 3:15 33:11	68:22 69:17 70:24	64:17 97:12	40:1 47:3,8 51:11	37:23 39:20,21
34:23 54:13 89:6	72:1	reports 31:10 63:16	57:9 90:6,20 91:8	40:18,21 41:15,19
refreshes 3:2	relying 33:24 54:20	63:16 92:20 97:4	99:24 100:11	41:21,25 42:4,10
refusal 77:3	118:21	represent 44:25	102:6,7,25 103:6	42:11,14,23 43:1
Refuse 92:5,8,9,10	remember 6:1	represented 61:10	103:13,21 105:10	43:4,6,13,17,20
96:9,12 97:4,16	32:19 34:9 45:21	reputation 73:5	retrospective 99:19	44:9,21 45:15,17
100:12 103:15,16	46:2 54:4,11 63:9	request 13:25 14:1	99:20	46:12,15,22 47:1
104:21,23 114:4	63:10,20 64:5	14:2	reuptake 90:21	48:16,25 49:14
regard 23:15 36:14	73:23 78:1 89:20	requested 67:17	review 3:21,22	50:9,16,20 51:7
61:19 103:24	111:14	75:4	11:20,21 12:12	51:12,14 53:8,15
114:4	repeat 104:16	require 115:24	19:20 26:11 54:17	54:25 55:3,10
regarding 21:20	repeated 61:10,12	required 57:19	55:1 57:23,24	56:7,9,12,18,25
37:18	61:15	73:9 76:11 86:25	70:24 71:1,4	57:6 58:10,13,15
regards 61:20	repeatedly 72:6	reread 34:15	72:14 73:24	58:17,23 59:4,9
REGION 1:20	rephrase 40:22	researchers 51:5	112:25	59:11,13,14,19,20
registers 105:21	replace 18:25	95:10,12 96:1,24	reviewed 19:23	59:22 60:1,10,14

60:25 61:3 62:4,7 62:9,10,13,15,24 63:4,6,12,14,23 64:16 65:23 66:6 66:8,13,16,18,21 66:22 67:2,22 68:17 70:6,15 71:22,23,24 72:9 72:15 73:8,11,18 73:22 77:12 78:12 80:2,21 81:1 82:13,13,17 83:3 84:6 85:2,2 87:16 88:24 91:3,17,19 91:21,24 92:11,20 93:2,6,9,13,19 94:3,4,8,10,13,17 95:10,18 96:1,13 96:13,23 101:8,15 102:8,14,21 103:16 104:5 105:24 106:13,18 109:10 110:4,9,12 111:25 113:21,23 114:6 115:1 116:23 117:16 118:10,22 rights 118:24 right-hand 19:7,7 26:21 61:8 rise 81:8 rises 55:17 risk 5:16 10:10 19:12 20:9 21:4 21:12,18 24:19,24 25:12,13,18,22 29:18 30:9 32:18 36:17 37:20 38:24 39:2,3,3 44:8,23 45:6,11 50:25 51:4 52:25 53:22 55:3 63:3 80:4 83:22 84:8,13 85:12 87:18 88:2 88:7 89:25 91:8 91:16,19 101:10 101:13,17,23	102:21 104:24 106:7,20 risks 19:16 21:5,13 26:8 road 68:23 rock-hard 12:4 RODANAST 1:9 Roger 37:9 67:3 room 17:8 64:19 roughly 47:22 63:10 route 13:9 Rufe 1:6 3:9,19 77:17 81:9 Rufhaus 61:20 rule 118:17 rulings 79:14 run 14:2 runs 116:20 <hr/> S S 1:14 safety 54:8 sake 104:15 sample 4:12,21 sampling 10:2 saw 16:19 22:1 51:16 55:1 74:13 76:10 77:11 saying 4:25 8:8,9 9:3 14:11 23:14 52:11,15,25 53:17 55:18 65:16 75:8 76:4,10,14,15,16 87:2 92:7 95:21 102:25 103:9 says 35:3 38:4 49:25 57:20 68:21 78:8 79:13 80:1,3 82:5 86:6 93:8 95:5 96:16 97:20 101:10 106:7,20 109:7,8,13 scaling 53:16 scheme 4:21,21 School 45:17 schooled 111:16	science 42:11 scientific 13:5 66:11 70:22 88:11 88:13,20,23 89:3 90:20 104:3 scientist 68:12,14 scientists 36:24 41:16 68:13 69:6 69:8 score 48:17,18 screen 6:5 20:24 39:17 66:20 screened 89:24 screens 20:12 Scroll 34:7 seal 120:11 SEAN 1:12 searches 74:6 searching 6:7 seat 18:18 seated 81:12 second 37:24 48:21 49:16 50:8 85:11 109:5 secondly 67:16 section 32:23 36:7 49:22 80:23 87:14 see 3:2,4 4:6 7:17 9:15 11:12 13:14 13:22,23 14:16 22:18,20 25:10 29:7 31:13 37:11 39:2 46:11 51:19 52:12 54:14,23 56:14 58:24 59:6 66:24 67:10 80:9 84:20 88:12 92:15 94:13 95:9 99:23 103:13 106:18 108:4,14 118:8 seeing 10:9 118:17 seen 23:16 41:5 83:12 93:25 94:7 94:12 108:18 selective 90:21 sense 6:19 47:23,25 53:16 70:7 98:12	sensitivity 12:3,8 34:11 sent 75:3,7 sentence 38:4 85:11 85:18,25 86:6 103:9 107:1,15 sentences 29:1 separate 12:1 24:16 62:22 91:20 septal 56:25 57:2 60:12,13,14,18 87:19 106:8,21 septals 57:14 September 1:4 78:2 serotonin 90:21 Sertraline 1:4 28:19 46:9 47:21 84:12 85:17 87:21 96:6,25 97:10,13 106:10,23 service 1:19 serving 62:9 session 81:9 set 6:8 12:12 23:11 40:11 46:17 settings 110:22 seven 23:1 58:13,17 58:17 severe 59:6,11,14 59:15 share 107:18 shared 68:13 shocked 22:4 short 90:4 short-cutted 29:22 shot 116:1,17 show 3:1 16:22 19:2 27:24 29:17 69:21 73:7 80:4 83:20 101:22 showed 16:11,13 27:21 55:11 69:16 109:6,11 showing 25:21 101:7 shown 16:7 70:5 102:7,10	shows 5:13,13 36:16 53:19 93:1 side 19:7 26:21 64:18 65:23 sides 101:4 significance 22:7 60:6 significant 21:4,9 21:21 23:22 24:13 25:12,17 27:14,22 29:10,14,18 30:11 32:17,24,25 33:2 38:17,20 40:8,10 45:8,12 47:15 56:8 57:4,6,13 58:12 59:22,25 60:11 61:5,8 103:10,17 significantly 26:7 sim 72:18 similar 38:5 46:12 simple 5:14 simplistic 98:18 simply 107:16 simulations 53:10 single 27:17 30:25 69:19 sir 7:14 12:11 13:1 21:22 31:4 33:17 34:23 42:10 55:10 61:1,9 64:3,7 66:17 82:8 93:19 94:8 site 89:2 92:1 sitting 35:15 56:4 situation 22:15 23:25 24:9 104:22 116:16 situations 5:22 six 73:25 size 4:21 40:11 41:5 sizes 4:13 SKADDEN 1:14 SLATE 1:14 slide 16:19,22 26:17 85:19 102:5 104:2 108:17,19
---	--	---	--	--

109:1,2,5,6,17 110:1 slides 16:4 17:7 73:8 108:6,18,22 109:4 118:4 slightly 12:10 15:17 38:7 small 8:16 smaller 113:20 smokers 53:6 smoking 52:25,25 53:4 SNRIs 40:1 software 57:19 solution 48:12 somebody 52:18 116:17 somebody's 20:25 somewhat 10:5 26:15 104:4 sophisticated 4:22 sorry 9:5,10,11 15:15 16:5 20:21 23:1 24:25 25:4 40:22,25 42:16,17 44:17 47:6 49:17 49:23 60:8 77:12 83:24 89:13 90:24 92:25 94:3,19 95:2,3,21 96:24 106:13,15,16 sort 10:22 42:19 52:18 80:8 118:11 sound 1:18 7:19 43:4 sounds 42:23 43:2 so-called 78:18 speak 14:10 SPEAKERS 81:11 119:9 speaking 113:4 special 42:7 specific 6:3 19:12 22:15 29:19 31:25 38:18 40:3,4 42:19 48:22 51:4 84:19,23 91:13	92:18 99:5 101:19 specifically 25:14 28:25 30:21 33:9 36:15 38:12,12 70:12 77:10,13 84:22 85:24 87:19 96:12 107:10 specificity 50:23 speculation 69:22 spend 4:2 spent 104:6 SQUARE 1:15 SSIs 96:5 SSRI 41:11,18 49:25 50:12 93:1 95:14 96:3,25 97:12 SSRIs 26:6,24 28:6 42:25 43:16 44:3 45:19 50:2 90:21 91:5,5,9,19 92:18 101:15,18 St 6:2 stages 112:25 stamped 84:2 stand 14:6 100:8 standard 73:1 standards 72:14 stands 79:25 start 24:21 50:19 57:12 78:14 79:15 116:3,4 started 44:6 73:18 78:2 starting 6:6 37:11 39:1 85:11 starts 85:6 state 19:14 37:12 37:18 82:8 84:25 86:1 91:24 101:24 stated 64:14 statement 27:17 38:22 40:2 64:9 64:10,11 65:23 66:19,23 84:21 85:17 88:1,11,13 88:20,23,24 89:3	89:6,18,21 90:20 98:2 102:18 107:4 116:14 statements 27:9 51:10 66:12 70:21 71:2 83:20 states 1:1,7 37:7 statin 62:16,19 63:4,14 64:2 statins 63:16 64:18 64:20 65:1,3,10 65:15,17 66:7 Statin's 62:22 statistical 5:17 22:7 57:8,19 112:8 statistically 21:4,9 21:21 25:12 29:18 30:11 32:25 33:2 38:8,16,17,19 40:7,10 47:14 52:5,8 56:8 57:5 58:12 59:22,24 61:5,7 103:10 statistician 48:6 52:17 53:9 55:20 71:3,8,9 81:17 112:21 statisticians 6:21 99:23 Statistics 112:13 Steering 1:9 step 42:10,13 46:12 48:21,21 113:10 115:1 STEPHEN 1:12 steps 11:12 stick 27:8 57:15,23 58:1 59:24 stipulate 70:3 stop 37:24 46:5 story 16:3 73:18,22 74:3,17 117:8 straight 29:7 Street 1:21 strength 10:1,7,13 strengthen 10:11 stretches 31:14	strike 49:10 Stroke 88:19 strong 51:23 struggle 95:2 studied 72:4 studies 3:15,16,18 4:8,11,15 5:12,24 6:23 8:16,18 9:24 9:25 10:16 11:7 17:23 24:18 25:15 29:13,17 30:4,22 32:5 33:22 35:7,9 35:10,16 36:20 37:1 39:6 40:12 40:18,19 41:4,6,7 41:12,21 44:4,6 50:8,11,12 51:9 51:14 52:14 54:2 58:13,16,25 59:4 59:5 61:9,15,17 61:20,22,24 66:5 66:22 69:19,20,25 69:25 70:8 72:5 73:1 80:4 84:11 84:18,20,24 85:12 85:25 86:3,5,10 86:13 87:21,22 88:3,3,7 89:3 96:22 97:1 100:5 100:7,11 101:25 103:11 106:9,22 110:1 113:4,5 study 4:3,19 5:18 11:20 14:25 17:16 18:25 19:2 27:16 27:20 30:25 31:6 31:10 32:2 33:3 34:13,14 36:25,25 42:3,21 43:14 44:1,7 45:10,19 46:5,12,14 49:6 51:21 52:12,14 60:6 64:16,22 65:9,20,21 66:1,8 71:23 93:2,5,7,15 93:20 94:9,14 95:7,22,23 96:1,6	96:9,9,12 97:5,5 97:17,19,20,21,22 97:23,23,25 98:10 98:10,11 99:3,14 100:23 101:1 102:2 105:22 113:17 114:4,10 studying 10:18 sub 12:20 subcategories 44:21 61:14 subcategory 26:21 31:18 subgroup 12:18 18:22,24 subgroups 30:24 submission 78:3 submissions 83:11 110:5 submit 82:16 submitted 63:18 70:17 74:4 82:23 83:4 subsequent 73:25 subsequently 3:13 46:18 54:8 subset 59:14 substantial 5:3 substantially 4:13 97:24 104:18 substantively 19:11 successfully 41:23 succinctly 115:16 sudden 76:21 suffer 65:3,17 suffered 32:1 suffering 101:24 sufficient 64:15 66:1 suggest 19:10 suggested 50:12 suggests 84:12 85:12 Suite 1:21 summarize 10:25 23:11 79:7 summarized 66:14
--	---	---	---	---

summary 5:3 17:25 83:22 84:8 85:13 85:14,23 86:8 88:6 Sunday 65:14 supersede 17:15 20:1 supersedes 20:2 supplant 20:1 supplement 12:15 14:24 15:1,2 77:24 supplemental 93:22 94:3 supplementary 39:21 support 20:9 24:18 24:18,22,24 supported 104:25 supporting 21:5 25:13,21 28:25 29:4 30:9 supports 30:18 suppose 80:5 supposed 8:17 75:12 80:16 sure 3:3 4:8,17 7:23 18:6 22:12,20 25:8 28:10 29:23 33:13 34:12 35:3 43:7,8,8,24,25 49:13 64:6 66:25 72:3 94:16 110:18 117:6,21 Surgery 88:18 surprise 39:4 119:2 surprised 12:24 32:19 surprising 53:24 117:12 survived 111:2,3 sustained 37:19 38:23 Swedish 61:21 sweeping 98:2 switch 54:3 sworn 118:18	symmetry 17:5 S17 39:21,22,25 <hr/> T T 120:1,1 tab 20:7,17,21,22 36:7 67:3 82:1 87:15 90:14 94:17 97:7 table 28:11,15 39:21,22,25 46:6 46:9 tackled 41:20 take 5:25 6:15,17 8:20 13:3 17:4,4 18:9 20:10 25:23 32:12 42:22 43:22 43:23 44:5 46:3 49:14,15 51:23 52:11 53:11 56:4 56:19 63:4 64:15 65:25 66:16 70:23 72:11 80:23 84:15 87:25 90:5 91:12 97:15 99:7 100:16 117:5 taken 6:1 25:25 33:15 45:2 72:9 talk 26:16 29:2 40:14,14 59:16 107:6 117:4,20 talked 3:13 16:16 40:12 96:9 100:20 101:25 104:14 talking 3:10 23:24 26:15,17,22,24 34:10 35:4 38:22 38:25 44:2 53:16 56:23 69:24 70:1 97:19 101:15 102:20 105:19 TCA s 40:1 teacher 15:15 team 13:14,23 14:16 40:14 55:15 71:22,23,23 76:1 114:23	tech 37:8 technically 117:19 techniques 4:7,17 tell 7:22,25 8:3 38:15 44:15 77:16 77:16,17,20 83:23 106:12 tells 35:23 89:21 tend 23:11,12 24:10 46:7 52:6 tendency 23:12,14 teratogen 76:6,12 teratogenic 19:17 50:1 terms 33:5 34:25 61:23 68:17 72:5 77:6 111:19 terrible 69:22 terribly 6:20 test 103:4 testified 30:17 31:4 31:8,21,24 54:22 62:18 85:21 111:7 testifies 78:14 testify 4:23 88:9 117:22 testifying 62:15 117:23 testimony 3:1,9,19 7:17 8:8 23:4 33:12 79:10 117:24 118:6,18 118:21 119:1 text 23:23 43:18 52:6 textbook 22:2 23:6 TGA 30:14,18,19 30:21,23 31:5,6,9 31:10,14,22 32:4 32:12 TGAs 30:25 thank 9:12,14 11:3 18:14,15 20:16 26:5 33:16 46:11 55:23,23 56:2,5 77:12 81:4 84:5 87:12 91:2 92:14	95:4,11 98:4,5,6,7 98:24 106:14 113:23,24 114:1 114:24 115:1,3 117:17 119:6,8,9 theirs 28:5 thereof 120:7 they'd 118:20 thing 9:9,19,21 35:3 41:8,9 70:19 73:17 97:4 112:4 117:18 things 8:11 10:6,14 10:22 18:5 22:1 26:16 27:10 49:1 57:25 71:19 72:22 79:2 105:13 115:17 118:15,19 think 9:22 10:21 11:2,3 13:7 14:21 16:24 17:7 18:9 20:11 21:25 31:23 31:24 35:18 37:3 40:14 41:8 42:12 45:8,18,23 47:23 48:4,5 54:4,6,10 55:25 56:2 60:4 64:4 65:3 66:14 66:17,19,23 67:1 68:10 71:3,19,20 72:20,21 73:6,8 74:8,22,22 75:13 76:11 77:11,18 78:5,6,9,23 79:1,2 79:13 80:12 82:1 82:5,10 83:12 87:8 89:8,13 91:22 94:2 98:19 101:10,14 103:12 103:20 104:13,21 107:5,8 109:7 113:9,10,16 115:15,19 116:12 116:15,21,22 117:4,7,8,15 118:9,15,17 thinking 70:20	83:5 thinks 48:7 third 85:4 96:23 Thomas 1:17 120:14 thought 5:21 12:8 64:23 thoughtfully 10:24 three 50:8 95:13 96:2,17,18 99:5 throw 35:8,8 throwing 75:21 tighten 18:5 time 6:21 11:13 18:7 34:2 35:20 54:7 63:12 76:17 76:22,23 77:17,20 104:6,15 107:3 116:4 117:5 timed 89:16 timely 74:12 times 1:15 34:16 61:11 65:14,15 86:7 89:1 95:13 96:2 Tiny 3:8 title 88:19 92:20 today 9:3 30:22 35:15 41:6 55:12 61:18 75:10,12 80:25 82:15 115:4 told 7:14 17:17 20:24 49:3,5 71:21 74:6,10 77:22 tomorrow 80:20 115:5 116:1 tonight 119:7 top 56:8 61:2 106:17,18 topics 54:3 total 60:25 85:12 totally 71:16 Trace 6:2 TRACEY 1:12 transcribed 109:17 120:4
---	---	--	---	---

TRANSCRIBER 1:17 transcript 1:6,19 9:5,6,6 22:21 119:3 transcription 1:19 18:2 109:15 transposition 30:14 treatment 10:17 88:19 89:21 trend 20:4,8 21:2 21:16,24 22:8,15 22:17 23:13,15,20 24:4,18,19 25:13 25:21 28:25 29:4 29:15 30:9 36:5 36:16 trending 22:2 23:7 trends 21:5,12 23:4 23:6 trial 3:24 10:3,4,5 10:12 30:17 31:8 31:21 65:10 73:20 82:18 118:7 trials 3:11,20 4:1 5:4 9:23 23:11,14 tried 5:12 12:1 31:17 78:15 trimester 11:10,15 11:17 19:11 84:12 85:3,5,16 87:21 106:10,23 tripped 81:19 trouble 20:11 troubles 46:5 true 7:14 35:1,13 41:4 114:8 trust 116:6 try 19:4 40:13 49:5 62:8 78:13 94:20 trying 10:6,21,22 10:25 15:10 27:24 30:1 35:18 39:17 69:15 77:25 90:4 99:15 113:20 tuned 89:10 turn 6:5 9:8 15:15	19:14 25:14 33:17 35:2 36:6 45:15 47:5 92:25 97:5 turning 22:24 twice 57:10 86:1 two 5:12,13,24 7:24 8:5 11:7,11 15:22 16:13,17 17:8,23 24:7 27:9,10 29:1 30:8,10 32:14 36:20 38:5,10,14 55:21 69:19 72:22 73:20,21 89:3 94:22 95:12 96:2 98:21 107:15 112:24 114:1 type 44:1 49:25 87:19 106:8,21 types 7:16 50:23 95:14 typically 61:25 <hr/> U Uh-huh 3:12 24:20 61:4 ultimate 107:20 ultimately 55:1 74:2 109:24 unadjusted 35:7,10 35:19 36:3 47:13 unclear 107:19 uncontrolled 64:16 65:9,20 66:1,5,8 undercuts 51:1 underlying 41:24 50:22 69:24 87:9 87:24 107:7,18 understand 15:9 38:3 56:16 69:13 77:6 117:19 118:20 understanding 119:4 understands 38:1 Understood 20:3 29:20 40:12 undoubtedly	112:16 undue 4:19 unexposed 32:10 47:20 unfair 71:16 76:17 119:2,3 unfortunately 82:4 UNITED 1:1,7 UNKNOWN 116:19 unmedicated 43:17 46:24 unnamed 78:17 unpublished 17:15 unrelated 62:20,20 un-adjustment 60:3 update 54:8 97:22 updates 54:8 upper 17:11 18:2 61:8 108:8,21,24 upset 64:19 use 3:23 10:15 11:9 15:21 16:6 19:10 20:5,6 21:6,10 22:9 23:9,9,17,20 23:21 24:12,14 26:6 41:10,19 44:6 47:16 57:11 57:18 67:7 69:15 79:10,10 87:22 90:21 91:5,9 97:12 99:3 100:5 114:10 117:24 118:9 useful 6:14 users 15:2 41:18 uses 113:1 usually 4:21 112:22 utilized 72:6 U.K 101:2 U.S 45:24,25 51:21 93:3 <hr/> V vague 54:9 valuable 6:20	value 8:14,14 16:11 variability 31:13 variable 37:13 variables 48:23 variation 5:4 varieties 7:24 8:5 10:16 various 27:25 80:9 99:17 112:25 vary 10:4 verbally 82:25 verbatim 64:6 verifier 58:3 verify 46:4 58:8 VERITEXT 1:20 Verizon 77:14 version 109:15,20 110:2 versus 11:10 68:11 71:4 view 6:25 10:1 20:2 visualization 35:18 35:23 60:24 61:7 61:13,22 100:8 voluble 8:12 <hr/> W wait 25:4 43:21 94:19 95:15 109:7 want 6:15 13:18 14:17 23:6,10 24:2 28:8 29:13 37:24 43:5,21 46:4 47:6 54:12 57:14,22 58:19 62:6 64:19 65:11 69:9 76:24 77:17 77:19,24,25 78:21 79:11,13 83:19 86:14,19 90:2 101:19 104:16 105:15 106:6 116:24 117:5 118:24 wanted 9:9,19 19:1 20:3 35:20 47:16 52:17 73:19	wants 118:3 warn 76:6 wary 68:14 wash 99:25 washed 88:7 wasn't 14:8 31:24 32:25 34:12 42:17 59:15 65:9 102:10 103:10 105:3,17 watch 55:16 way 4:16 6:9,10 12:10 13:8 14:13 14:21 20:1 23:16 24:7 40:7 41:20 46:7 48:4,6 71:11 73:18 79:17,19 80:3 82:4 92:7 ways 81:15 weakness 10:1,6 website 82:6 94:10 94:11,14 96:13 97:8,16 week 75:9 77:16 94:12 weight 4:11,14 weighted 4:9 5:14 weighting 4:20 5:2 Wemacher 49:3,5 49:10,15,15,16 53:23 59:7,13,18 Wemaker 49:3 went 16:17 27:13 29:6 57:23 71:14 81:22 107:19 weren't 83:8 we'll 19:3 70:3 116:3 117:6,7 118:4,24 we're 9:6 11:3 13:8 14:10 17:13 20:11 21:2 26:1,3 29:8 44:2 58:3,6 67:4 67:10,13,15 71:25 72:12,16,17 74:9 75:12 77:25 80:9 81:5,20 94:19 105:19 109:22
--	---	--	---	---

119:10 we've 16:9 20:12 30:22 36:1 38:14 38:25 40:12,16 41:5 45:9 53:21 56:11 60:16 67:17 69:16 71:13 74:6 74:6 76:4,12,17 78:4 95:2 97:19 100:1 101:25 106:3 115:12,20 Whereabouts 25:5 white 16:5 wholly 106:10,23 who've 72:18 width 32:20 willing 13:6 14:6 44:5 105:10 wine 8:3 wish 13:10 64:13 wishes 71:22 withdrew 64:9 65:23 witness 2:3 20:18 20:20 25:7 34:4 49:22 55:20,22,23 81:14,16 89:15 90:16,18 95:24 108:17 115:3 120:11 witnesses 115:5,8 woman 11:8 women 5:18 11:15 11:16 12:1 32:12 40:18,23 41:10,13 41:19 42:8,24 43:15 45:20,23 46:1,10,23,23 47:14,19 51:17 53:6,22 84:11 85:16 95:13 96:3 97:12 101:4 104:17,24 105:13 112:23 word 9:16 15:6,16 15:18,21 20:4,5 21:2,8,14,24,25	22:8,10,15,16 23:8,10,16,17,20 24:4 36:5 42:23 43:22,23 44:5 46:3 58:4,7 84:10 99:4 words 3:23 5:9 24:10 29:13 79:25 101:4 109:1 work 14:6 46:7 62:20 70:17 72:10 73:25 99:15 119:7 worked 13:20 working 62:12,12 62:21 63:13 works 71:22 78:20 world 71:4,23 76:14 world's 112:16 worried 41:13 worst 99:17 wouldn't 5:9 32:19 53:9 56:19 60:20 62:6 105:15 116:11 would've 17:25 48:6,7 103:11 104:18 105:12 write 36:10 writing 83:1 writings 64:12 written 54:24 57:18 63:15,16 79:23 87:10 103:9 wrong 17:3,9 35:25 36:1 43:24 66:3 89:16 wrote 14:11 34:13 50:15 62:22 71:17 <hr/> X X 2:1 68:23 <hr/> Y Yates 3:5,7 18:4,8 18:14,19 20:15,19 20:21,23 21:1	25:9 29:21,24 49:23,24 56:2,6 67:6,25 68:2,10 69:3,7 70:12,19 79:2,5,5,25 80:22 81:2,4,18 83:13 83:16,18 86:21 87:7,11,13 89:13 89:16,17 90:11,14 90:17,19 92:13 95:1,21,25 96:18 96:19 98:5 110:6 114:1,3 year 98:17,23,24,25 99:2 years 7:12 yesterday 5:12 7:3 8:9 9:3,16 10:8 11:6,11 13:2,8 16:2,4,12 20:17 30:22 31:17 41:9 48:20 53:11 54:10 54:22 56:14 61:13 61:18 100:6 104:6 104:15,21 108:23 109:3 yielded 37:13 47:4 47:9 York 1:15,15 65:14 65:15 Young 45:18 88:16 <hr/> Z Zoloff 1:3 5:6 6:1 11:4,8,9 24:12 25:14 26:17 27:5 28:3,19 30:19 31:6 32:12 35:1 35:14 36:15 38:2 38:12 40:1,3,5 41:5,11 44:2,8 45:19 46:1,19,19 46:23 47:11 53:5 53:6 66:12 78:7 82:5,9 85:23,25 86:5 89:3,23,25 91:13,14 93:1	99:10 101:19 102:8 Zoloff's 76:6 Zonies 1:11 20:17 34:3,6 54:22 67:8 67:24 69:9,11 74:25 75:2 78:15 79:18,21 82:2 86:14,24 89:7,10 89:11 98:7,8 108:15,25 109:22 110:11,13,16 114:25 115:7 116:10,11,15,21 117:18 118:8,11 119:6 <hr/> 0 0.4 28:21 0.7 28:20 02 16:11 <hr/> 1 1 5:19 20:21,22 44:14,17 47:5,7 51:17 53:17 82:1 1.0 5:16 60:17 1.01 85:13 1.07 16:10 1.1 16:21 40:5 109:8,18 1.16 47:10,22 1.17 85:14 1.23 85:15 1.24 47:14 1.27 47:21 1.3 24:23 28:21 1.33 40:6 1.39 102:20 1.41 47:11 1.8 38:11,16 1.87 16:10 1.9 16:20 53:17 109:7,8 1:56 18:17 10 7:12 18:13 44:6 47:22 48:10,14	51:19 52:7,12,13 60:4 10:00 116:3 10036 1:15 103 6:6 105 35:2 11 35:4 67:4 98:15 98:16 110 36:7 106:10 114 2:3 12 28:24 67:4 12th 77:11 12:49 18:17 13 93:22 131 36:21 132 36:21 14 22:25 33:19 34:6 34:18 14th 77:13 78:4 14,000 46:1,10 170 33:17,18 176 20:7 17601 1:10 18.62 31:15 1800 1:21 1801 1:21 19 65:3,6 19103 1:21 1996 105:24 <hr/> 2 2 1:4 5:19 7:7 8:13 46:6,6,9 50:11 51:23 95:5 99:5 109:12,13 2,402 46:6 2.3 38:13,16 45:22 2.39 16:11 109:15 2.7 60:5 2:00 18:11,13 2:12-md-02342-... 1:2 20 98:22 104:23 2003 105:24 2007 24:21 25:21 26:2 2010 105:20
--	--	--	---	---

2011 30:3 33:3	48 61:5			
2012 41:17				
2013 57:3 63:8	5			
2014 42:14,17,23	5 5:14 7:7 8:13			
43:13 45:16 54:4	24:22 25:1,7 30:5			
54:11 78:2 101:1	37:2 51:23			
2015 1:4 56:11 74:5	5:10 119:13			
92:23,25 93:23	50 3:25			
120:12	59 60:25 61:2,3,5			
22 28:20 63:8				
230 97:7	6			
232 94:17	6 9:8,13,18			
235 67:3	60 21:11 36:6			
24 22:25 23:2 44:9				
2402 39:11,13	7			
2403 47:5	7 6:6 34:18,18 54:4			
2405 19:3,4,7,14	97:5,7			
2406 19:15	70 85:15			
25 65:17	75 22:24,25 23:1,2			
2684 25:22 26:4	76 22:24,25 23:1			
2691 28:11,15	777-6690 1:22			
27th 75:3,8	79 103:8			
29 92:23				
	8			
3	8 33:22 34:12 37:16			
3 1:6 2:3 28:11,15	49:16,16,19 90:5			
96:18	91:1 93:9			
3.08 60:7,8	801 1:10			
3.3 16:21 108:22	88 85:14			
109:2,8,18	888 1:22			
3.8 60:2,7				
3:27 81:7	9			
30 9:16 104:23	9 48:14 52:2,22			
31 9:5,8,11,12,18	90 97:18			
39:25	93 85:15			
35 31:14	95 47:10 85:13,15			
3744 84:4	98 2:3			
3745 85:2				
3746 106:14				
39 45:11				
4				
4 20:6,7,10 21:3				
24:22,25 25:5,7				
25:11 30:5 92:25				
4:20 81:7				
40 97:11 102:20				